This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

NYPL RESEARCH
3 3433 07029815 7

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Calvin

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CALVIN'S TRACTS

RELATING TO

THE REFORMATION.

VOL. I.

Digitized by Google

THE CALVIN TRANSLATION SOCIETY,

INSTITUTED IN MAY M.DCCC.XLIII.

FOR THE PUBLICATION OF TRANSLATIONS OF THE WORKS OF JOHN CALVIN.

Digitized by Google

TRACTS

RELATING TO

THE REFORMATION.

BY JOHN CALVIN.

WITH

HIS LIFE BY THEODORE BEZA.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN,

BY HENRY BEVERIDGE, ESQ.

VOLUME FIRST.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR THE CALVIN TRANSLATION SOCIETY.

M.DCCC.XLIV.

Digitized by Google

LENOX LIBRARY
NEW YORK

EDINBURGH PRINTING COMPANY, SOUTH ST DAVID STREET.

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
Digitized by Google

PREFACE.

THE present Volume chiefly consists of Tracts, which, though unquestionably the production of CALVIN'S pen, and every way worthy of it, have hitherto been inaccessible to the English reader. They are somewhat miscellaneous in their nature, but, as bearing directly on the leading points at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants, may be classed under the head of Tracts relating to the Reformation.

The Tract first in order, viz., SADOLET'S LETTER TO THE GENEVESE, with CALVIN'S REPLY, derives great interest not only from the important points discussed in it, but also from the circumstances in which the discussion took place. Owing to the unchristian spirit which prevailed in Geneva, Calvin, with his colleagues, Corald and Farel, deemed themselves justified in resorting to the strong measure of declining to dispense the Communion. The popular resentment was roused, and bad men taking advantage of it, succeeded in obtaining a decree, by which those three Pastors were summarily banished from the city. It was hoped that the de-

Digitized by Google

cree, the effect apparently of momentary ebullition, would be rescinded, and other Churches with this view interposed their mediation. But the decree, however rashly made, was resolutely enforced, and the Pastors were obliged to take what must have been regarded as their final leave.

The opportunity was too tempting for Rome not to avail herself of it; and, accordingly, one of her highest dignitaries, an accomplished scholar, and what was rarer in those times, a man of great public and private worth, came forward with an artful address, in which, under strong expressions of attachment to his "very dear brethren" the Genevese, and anxious desires to promote their interests, both secular and spiritual, he laboured to woo them back to the See of Rome.

The person best able to answer the Letter had been ignominiously exiled, and Sadolet naturally calculated, that while the resentment of the people would procure a favourable hearing to his representations, the resentment of Calvin would not allow him to expose them. From the account which Beza gives, it would seem that the former calculation was correct. Not so the latter. The whole history of Calvin's life shows that zeal for the interest of the Church was his ruling passion, and, therefore, when he saw the mischief which Sadolet's Letter threatened to produce, he at once forgot his own wrongs, and laboured as zealously for the best interests of the Genevese as if he had still been discharging the office of Pastor among them.

The Reply, besides containing a triumphant vindication of the Reformed doctrine—a vindication so triumphant that

Digitized by Google

Sadolet is said to have forthwith given up the affair as desperate, is written in a spirit of meekness and candour. Calvin is even more eulogistic of his opponent than any thing in Sadolet's Letter seems to justify, and in so far gives a practical refutation of the charge that he never engaged in controversy without losing his temper and insulting his opponent. The Letter and Reply bear the date of 1539.

The next Tract of the Volume contains a series of ARTICLES, in which the Theological Faculty of Paris (THE SORBONNE) took it upon them authoritatively to declare what all religious instructors were bound to teach, and the whole Church to believe. It seems that the Sorbonnists had not been able to keep their own body free from the taint of what they called heresy, and as the most effectual method of extirpating it, drew up these Articles for subscription by all their members, and by all candidates for membership.

The object being to expel every man whose convictions would not allow him to subscribe, care was taken to exhibit the most obnoxious tenets of Popery in the strongest terms in which it was possible to state them, and thereby render evasion impossible. The effect has been to give an air of absurdity to the gravest of their statements, and make it difficult to treat them with seriousness. To this circumstance, the form which Calvin has given to his Antidote is probably to be ascribed. He first gives an Article, and immediately subjoins what he calls the Proof. You accordingly begin to read, never doubting that the Proof is from the pen of the Sorbonnist who framed the Article, but soon meet with arguments, which, though very much in the manner of a

Digitized by Google

Sorbonnist, tell most powerfully against him, and reveal the fact, that what purports to be a Proof by the Sorbonnist is indeed a proof—not, however, of the thing said to be proved, but of its opposite; in other words, is a *Reductio ad absurdum* by Calvin.

This mode of refutation probably told better in Paris than the most solid discussion would have done; but Calvin, apparently aware that ridicule, especially in matters of religion, is a dangerous, and from its very nature an imperfect weapon, fitted only to demolish error, and not to establish truth, immediately subjoins what properly forms the Antidote, viz. a clear statement of sound doctrine, confirmed by passages of Scripture, and supported by numerous quotations from the Fathers.

Some persons are so little acquainted with Calvin's writings as to imagine, that in forming his theological system he set all human authority at defiance, and deliberately opposed his own judgment to the general consent of Christian antiquity. There cannot be a greater mistake. The leading principle of Protestantism—the paramount authority and perfect sufficiency of Scripture—he undoubtedly did hold and strenuously inculcate, but he also venerated the early Fathers of the Church, and scarcely ever omitted an opportunity of strengthening his views by showing how well they accorded with theirs. In proof of the fact, it is sufficient to refer to this Antidote, which is rich in Patristic lore, and well merits the attention of all who desire to see a short authoritative statement of the peculiar tenets of the Romish Church, and a refutation of them equally solid and sarcastic. Its date is 1542.

Digitized by Google

The next, and unquestionably the most important, Tract of the Volume is THE NECESSITY OF REFORMING THE CHURCH, which is written in the form of an Address to the Diet which met at Spires in 1543, and bears to be presented "in the name of all who would have Christ to reign." It does not appear that Calvin was actually employed by the Protestants of Germany, but he writes in their name, and with an ability which must have been of essential service to their cause. His object being to justify the course which the Reformers had taken, he proposes to consider the three following points :—

FIRST, The evils which compelled the Reformers to have recourse to remedies.

SECOND, The particular remedies which they employed.

THIRD, The necessity of an immediate application of these remedies.

It is obvious that these heads embrace the whole question at issue between the Protestants and those who, whether nominally of the Romish Church or not, favour its pretensions. The Treatise, accordingly, is not of the ephemeral interest of the Diet which gave occasion to it, but embraces the great questions by which the Church is agitated at the present day. Indeed, in reading it, one is often led insensibly into the belief, that, instead of being the production of three centuries ago, it is a powerful protest written by some modern hand against the prevailing errors and threatened dangers of our own times. It is certainly melancholy to think that the Church should still be combating errors

Digitized by Google

which were so long ago triumphantly refuted; but it is pleasing to think that that refutation still exists, and is now to obtain, through the medium of the Calvin Translation Society, a circulation far more extensive than it has ever yet had. Every one who studies it thoroughly puts himself in possession of a weapon offensive and defensive, which will enable him, within his own sphere, to fight the battle of true Protestantism against open enemies and treacherous friends.

The occasion on which "The Necessity of Reforming the Church" was written was well fitted to call forth Calvin's utmost powers. He had undertaken to plead the cause which was dearest to his heart before an assembly perhaps the most august that Europe could then have furnished. In similar circumstances the advocate is usually dispirited by a consciousness that his efforts will be unavailing; but on this occasion there was some ground to hope that he might not plead in vain. Not only were several Princes of the Empire, and other members of the Diet, avowedly in favour of the Protestant cause, but the Emperor himself seemed not indisposed to do it justice. The strongest passions of his mind were ambition and bigotry, and when both could be gratified, the Protestants had everything to fear. Now, however, the two passions were at variance, and it was generally supposed that when the Emperor found it impossible to prosecute his ambitious schemes without conciliating the Protestants, he would take the necessary steps for that purpose, though it should be at the expense of a rupture with Rome. Hence this Diet was looked forward to with the deepest interest by all parties.

Digitized by Google

Calvin's task thus was not merely to give a solid unimpassioned defence of Protestant doctrine, but to work upon the minds of those whom he addressed, and suggest and enforce considerations which, while founded on Christian principles, would not be without influence on mere politicians. His style, accordingly, is more animated than he might have deemed necessary or becoming in an ordinary theological discussion, and passages occasionally occur which, in point of eloquence, would not lose by comparison with any thing in the celebrated Dedication prefixed to his Institutes. Those who betray their ignorance, while they would display their wit, by sneering at Calvin as a dry, crabbed, lumbering theologian, would do well to read this Treatise, which certainly proves that its distinguished author, had he been so disposed, might easily have obtained a first place in literature and political science. Happily for himself, and for the world at large, he was directed to a better course,—a course which, while it might have seemed to have shut him out from fame, has given it to him in a purer form, and to a wider extent, than mere literature and statesmanship could have bestowed.

The expectations which the Protestants had entertained, though not fully realised by the Diet of Spires, were not altogether disappointed. Of this we have a very complete and interesting proof in the next Tract of the present Volume. The Diet decreed that, in the meantime, Protestants should continue in the possession of their rights, and a promise was given by the Emperor that no time would be lost in assembling a General Council for the final determination of religious differences. His Holiness, Pope Paul III., appears to have been horrified at these concessions. He was

Digitized by Google

equally grieved and provoked at the threatened revolt of his "very dear son" the Emperor; and having, as he says, the example of Eli before him, felt bound to eschew it, in order that he might not expose himself to Eli's punishment. He accordingly addressed the Emperor in what is designated a PATERNAL ADMONITION, warning him of the dangers to which his "evil communication" with heretics was exposing him, and concluding with a very significant hint of the punishment which his Holiness, notwithstanding of his natural meekness, might be compelled, by an imperative sense of duty, to inflict. The whole Admonition affords a curious, and, if any need it, a very convincing specimen of the arrogant pretensions of the Church of Rome.

Calvin's REMARKS are occasionally written in a harsher spirit than might be wished. The animadversions may not be beyond the Pope's deserts; but it must be admitted, that Calvin, while thinking only of what was due to his opponent, has sometimes forgotten what was due to himself. The excuse that he wrote in the spirit of his age, though the best that can be offered, is not quite satisfactory, as it may be rejoined, that men endowed with such talents as Calvin possessed are bound not to follow, but to guide, and, when necessary, to contradict the spirit of their age. Still, overlooking the occasional harshness of the Remarks, it is impossible to deny that they are full of talent and learning, and most effectually refute the arrogant pretensions of the Romish See. In particular, the Pope's unfortunate allusion to the case of Eli's sons is made to tell so powerfully against him, that Pallavicini, in his History of the Council of Trent, has judged it necessary to come to the rescue. His defence, however, is more zealous than wise. Without denying the

Digitized by Google

immoralities with which Calvin had charged the Pope, he merely argues, that such immoralities, if held to exclude the party guilty of them from proceeding against other delinquents, would put an end to all discipline and government. It may be made a question, by which of the two the Pope suffered most—the severity of Calvin's Remarks, or the ingenuousness of Pallavicini's defence.

The next Tract in the Volume, viz., ON THE ADVANTAGES OF AN INVENTORY OF RELICS, being designed to expose the very gross delusions practised by the Church of Rome on the most ignorant of her votaries, and being consequently intended, in a more especial manner, for those who, as they yielded to such delusions, must have held a low place in intellectual culture, is written in a very popular and homely style, and must have told powerfully on all not absolutely determined to act on the celebrated axiom, "*Credo quia impossibile.*" The detail of absurdities and impostures given in this Tract threatens at times to be tiresome, but is every now and then relieved by the introduction and enforcement of great principles, which strike at the foundation of the whole system of Romish imposture, and completely establish the identity of its image and relic worship with the gross idolatry of the heathen.

THE LIFE OF CALVIN, though several writers have attempted to give it, is still to be written. Had the distinguished author, who had undertaken the task, been spared to accomplish it, we should doubtless have had a work entitled to take its place by the side of the Life of Knox; but the mere fact of its having employed his pen appears to have deterred others, and this important blank in Biography

Digitized by Google

has hitherto been permitted to remain. In the meantime, so far to satisfy the curiosity which Calvin's readers must naturally feel to know the events of his life and the leading features of his character, it has been deemed advisable to introduce the present Volume with a new translation of the Life which was written in Latin by Beza, and is usually prefixed to the editions of Calvin's Works. It is not without its merits as a biography; but, independent of them, as containing a delineation of Calvin's conduct by an eye-witness and intimate friend, will never be entirely superseded by any biography that may yet be written.

Before concluding, the Translator may be permitted to observe, that, in accordance with the views of the Calvin Translation Society, his endeavour has been to give the original as literally as he could without doing violence to the English idiom. How far he has succeeded it belongs to others to decide.

H. B.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS OF VOLUME FIRST.

	PAGE
Life of John Calvin, by Theodore Beza, .	xvii—c
Letter by James Sadolet, a Roman Cardinal, to the Senate and People of Geneva, . .	3
Reply by John Calvin to Letter by Cardinal Sadolet to the Senate and People of Geneva, .	25
Articles agreed upon by the Faculty of Sacred Theology of Paris, with the Antidote, . .	72
The Necessity of Reforming the Church, .	123
A Paternal Admonition by the Roman Pontiff, Paul III,, to the Most Invincible Emperor, Charles V., .	237
Remarks on the Letter of Pope Paul III., .	257
An Admonition, showing the Advantages which Christendom might derive from an Inventory of Relics, .	289

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

LIFE OF JOHN CALVIN,

CAREFULLY WRITTEN BY

THEODORE BEZA,

MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF GENEVA.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

LIFE OF JOHN CALVIN,

BY

THEODORE BEZA.

SHOULD any one suppose that I have engaged in writing this Life of John Calvin from any other motive than zeal to maintain the truth, the present state of human affairs will, I hope, easily vindicate me from the calumny. For there is scarcely any shorter road to all kinds of disaster than to praise virtue; and it were extreme folly voluntarily to bring down on one's self evils which mere silence may avert. But if the wicked allow no kind of virtue to be proclaimed with impunity, what must those expect, whose object it is to proclaim piety, which is of a higher order than virtue, and is not only opposed by the wicked, but is also very often assailed even by persons who are most desirous to appear, and sometimes also to be, honest? For piety has no enemies more inveterate than those who have sincerely embraced a false religion, thinking it true. But these things, however formidable in appearance, have not at all deterred me. For it were shameful if, from fear of the wicked, the good were not to be spoken of, and if the voice of religion were to be suppressed by the clamours of the superstitious.

Digitized by Google

But should any one object, that to write the Life of Calvin is a very different thing from defending the truth, I will at once admit that man and truth are very different things; this, however, I will not hesitate to say, that He who is truth itself did not speak rashly when he said, "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you," (John xx. 21,) and "whoso heareth you heareth me," (Luke x. 16.) Let men, therefore, (both those who believe through ignorance, and those who so speak from malice,) cry out, that Luther, Zuinglius, and Calvin, are regarded by us as gods, though we are continually charging the worshippers of saints with idolatry; let them, I say, cry out as much and as long as they please,—we are prepared with our answer, viz., that to commemorate the labours which holy men have undertaken in behalf of religion, together with their words and actions, (through the knowledge of which the good become better, while the wicked are reproved, our only aim in this kind of composition,) is a very different thing from doing as they do, when they either bring disgrace on the lives of men who were truly pious, by narratives not less impious than childish, (as an obscure individual called Abdias did with the history of the Apostles,) or compose fabulous histories filled with the vilest falsehoods, (they, in their barbarous jargon, call them Golden Legends, I call them abominable trash,) and endeavour, moreover, to bring back the idols of the ancient Gods, the only difference being a change of name.

We are as far from these worshippers of the dead as light is from darkness. Against conduct such as theirs, the Lord denounces the severest threatenings; ours, on the contrary, he commends, when he bids us keep both our bodily and mental eye intent upon his works. Nobody, I presume, will deny, that of all the works of God, men best deserve to be known and observed, and of men, those of them who have

Digitized by Google

been distinguished at once for learning and piety. It is not without cause Daniel (Dan. xii. 3) compares holy men of God to stars, since they by their brightness show the way of happiness to others. Those who allow that brightness to be entirely extinguished by death, deserve to be themselves plunged in thicker darkness than before. I have no intention, however, to imitate those who, in their eagerness for declamation and panegyric, have not so much adorned the truth as brought it into suspicion. Trying not how elegantly, but how truly I could write, I have preferred the style of simple narrative.

JOHN CALVIN was born at Noyons, a celebrated town in Picardy, or at least on the confines of Picardy, on the 27th July, in the year of our Lord 1509. His father's name was Gerard Calvin, his mother's Joan Franc, both of them persons of good repute, and in easy circumstances. Gerard being a person of no small judgment and prudence, was highly esteemed by most of the nobility of the district, and this was the reason why young Calvin was from a boy very liberally educated, though at his father's expense, in the family of the Mommors, one of the most distinguished in that quarter. Having afterwards accompanied them to Paris in the prosecution of his studies, he had for his master in the College of La Marche, Maturinus Corderius, a man of great worth and erudition, and in the highest repute in almost all the schools of France as a teacher of youth. He attained the age of 85, and died (the same year as Calvin) at Geneva, while a professor in the Academy of that city. Calvin afterwards removed to the College of Mont Aigu, and there had for his master a Spaniard, a man of considerable attainments. Under him Calvin, who was a most diligent student, made such progress, that he left his fellow-students behind in the

Digitized by Google

Grammar course, and was promoted to the study of Dialectics, and what is termed Arts.

His father had at first intended him for the study of Theology, to which he inferred that he was naturally inclined; because, even at that youthful age, he was remarkably religious, and was also a strict censor of every thing vicious in his companions. This I remember to have heard from some Catholics, unexceptionable witnesses, many years after he had risen to celebrity.

Being thus, as it were, destined to the sacred office, his father procured a benefice for him from the Bishop of Noyons, in what is called the Cathedral church, and thereafter the cure of a parish connected with a suburban village called Pont-Eveque, the birth-place of his father, who continued to live in it till his removal to the town. It is certain that Calvin, though not in priest's orders, preached several sermons in this place before he quitted France. The design of making him a priest was interrupted by a change in the views both of father and son—in the former, because he saw that the Law was a surer road to wealth and honour, and in the latter, because, having been made acquainted with the reformed faith, by a relation named Peter Robert Olivet, (the person to whom the churches of France owe that translation of the Old Testament, from the Hebrew, which was printed at Neufchatel,) he had begun to devote himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and, from an abhorrence at all kinds of superstition, to discontinue his attendance on the public services of the Church.

Having set out for Orleans, to study law, which was there taught by Peter De l'Etoile, by far the first French lawyer of that period, Calvin, in a short time, made such astonishing progress, that he very often officiated for the

Digitized by Google

professors, and was considered rather a teacher than a pupil. On his departure, he was presented with a Doctor's degree, free of expense, and with the unanimous consent of all the professors, as a return for the services which he had rendered to the Academy. Meanwhile, however, he diligently cultivated the study of sacred literature, and made such progress, that all in that city who had any desire to become acquainted with a purer religion, often called to consult him, and were greatly struck both with his learning and his zeal. Some persons, still alive, who were then on familiar terms with him, say, that, at that period, his custom was, after supping very frugally, to continue his studies until midnight, and on getting up in the morning, to spend some time meditating, and, as it were, digesting what he had read in bed, and that while so engaged, he was very unwilling to be interrupted. By these prolonged vigils he no doubt acquired solid learning, and an excellent memory; but it is probable he also contracted that weakness of stomach, which afterwards brought on various diseases, and ultimately led to his untimely death.

The Academy of Bourges had, at this time, acquired great celebrity through Andrew Alciat, (undoubtedly the first lawyer of his age,) who had been invited to it from Italy. Calvin thought it right to study under him also. He accordingly went thither, and on grounds, both religious and literary, formed a friendship with Melchior Wolmar, a German from Rothweil, and professor of Greek. I have the greater pleasure in mentioning his name, because he was my own teacher, and the only one I had from boyhood up to youth. His learning, piety, and other virtues, together with his admirable abilities as a teacher of youth, cannot be sufficiently praised. On his suggestion, and with his assistance, Calvin learned Greek. The recollection of the

Digitized by Google

benefit which he thus received from Wolmar, he afterwards publicly testified by dedicating to him his Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

While engaged in these studies, Calvin still diligently cultivated sacred literature, and also occasionally preached in Liniere, a village near Bourges, in the presence, and with the approbation, of its proprietor.

A sudden intimation of the death of his father called him back to his native town. Shortly after, in his twenty-fourth year, he went to Paris, and there wrote his excellent Commentary on Seneca's Treatise, De Clementia. This very grave writer being obviously in accordance with Calvin's disposition, was a great favourite with him. A few months' residence here made him known to all who desired a reform in religion. Among others, I have heard him mention, with strong testimony to his piety, Stephen Forge, a distinguished merchant, who afterwards suffered martyrdom in the cause of Christ, and to whose name Calvin gave celebrity in the work which he published against the Libertines.

About this time, Calvin renouncing all other studies, devoted himself to God, to the great delight of all the pious who were then holding secret meetings in Paris. It was not long before an occasion occurred for strenuous exertion. The person who at this time held the office of Rector in the University of Paris was Nicholas Cop, son of William Cop of Bâsle, physician to the King. He having, according to custom, to deliver an oration on the 1st of November, the day on which the festival of All Saints is celebrated by the Papists, Calvin furnished him with one in which religion was treated more purely and clearly than it was previously wont to be. This could not be tolerated by the Sorbonne, and being also disapproved by the Senate, or Parliament, that body cited the Rector to appear before them. He accordingly set out with

Digitized by Google

his officers, but being warned on the way to beware of his enemies, turned back, and afterwards quitting the country, retired to Bâsle. Search was made at the College of Fortret, where Calvin was then residing. He happened not to be at home, but his papers were seized, and among them numerous letters from his friends. However, the worst which happened was, that the lives of many of them were brought into the greatest jeopardy—so very bitter were those judges against the Church, and, in particular, one of their number, called John Morin, whose savage proceedings are well remembered. This tempest the Lord dispersed by the instrumentality of the Queen of Navarre, (only sister of Francis, the reigning monarch,) a woman of distinguished genius, and at this time a great patroness of the Reformers. Inviting Calvin to her Court, she received him, and listened to him with the greatest respect.

Calvin after this left Paris, and removing to the province of Saintonge, became assistant to a friend, at whose request he wrote certain brief Christian exhortations, which in some parishes were read during divine service, in order that the people might be gradually trained to the investigation of the truth. About this time also he went to Nerac, in Gascony, to pay a visit to old James Lefevre of Estaples, whose life had been brought into danger by the babbling Sorbonnists, who had attacked him for his animadversions on scholastic theology, and his pursuits in mathematics, and other branches of philosophy, which have been restored to the University of Paris, but not without a very long and bitter contest. This good old man, whom the Queen of Navarre had delivered out of the hands of the Sorbonnists, and placed in Nerac, which was subject to her authority, was delighted with young Calvin, and predicted that he would prove a distinguished instrument in restoring the kingdom of heaven in France. Calvin, after

Digitized by Google

some time, returned to Paris, brought thither as it seemed directly by the hand of God. For the impious Servetus, who had already begun to circulate his venomous attacks on the Holy Trinity, had arrived. As he pretended to be most desirous of a conference, Calvin fixed the time and place, though at the greatest risk of his life, (the rage of the enemy compelling him at that time to be in hiding,) but Servetus never came. A mere sight of Calvin was more than he could bear. This was in the year 1534, a year rendered famous by savage proceedings against many of the Reformers—Gerard Roussel, a Doctor of Sorbonne, but a great favourer of the new doctrines, and also Corald, of the order of St Augustine, who, aided by the Queen of Navarre, had done much during this and the previous year to promote the cause of Christ in Paris, having been not only driven from the pulpit, but thrown into prison. And to such a degree was the rage of the infatuated monarch Francis inflamed, on account of certain squibs against the mass which had been circulated over the city, and even fixed to the door of his own bed-chamber, that a public fast having been appointed, during which he went to church along with his three children, with his head uncovered, and carrying a blazing torch as a kind of expiation, he ordered thirty-two martyrs to be burned alive, (eight at each of the four most public places in the city,) and also declared with solemn oath that he would not spare even his own children, if they were infected with those dire heresies, as he called them.

Calvin perceiving this state of matters, shortly after he had published his admirable Treatise, entitled Psychopannychia, against the error of those who, reviving a doctrine which had been held in the earliest ages, taught that the soul, when separated from the body, falls asleep, determined to withdraw from France. Accordingly, in company with the person

Digitized by Google

whom we have mentioned that he lived with for some time at Saintonge, he set out to Bâsle, by the way of Lorraine; but when not far from the town of Metz, was brought into the greatest difficulty by the perfidy of one of his servants, who ran off with all the money belonging to both, and being mounted on the stronger horse, suddenly fled with such speed that it was impossible to overtake him. His masters were thus left so unprovided with the means of travelling, that they were obliged to borrow ten crowns from the other servant, and in that way arrived with difficulty, first at Strasburgh, and afterwards at Bâsle. There he lived on intimate terms with those two distinguished men, Simon Grynæus and Wolfgang Capito, and devoted himself to the study of Hebrew. Though most desirous to remain in retirement, as appears from a letter which Bucer addressed to him in the following year, he was compelled to publish his Institutes of the Christian Religion, a rude sketch of that most celebrated work. The German princes, who had espoused the cause of the Gospel, and whose friendship Francis was then courting, feeling offended with him at his persecutions of the Protestants, the excuse offered, on the suggestion of William Bellay of Lange, was, that he had not punished any but Anabaptists, who substituted their own spirit for the divine Word, and held all civil magistrates in contempt. Calvin not submitting to have such a stigma fixed on the true religion, seized the opportunity to publish what must be regarded as an incomparable work, accompanying it with an excellent prefatory address to the King himself. Had the monarch read it, I am much mistaken if a severe wound would not even then have been inflicted on the Babylonish harlot. For that prince, unlike those who succeeded him, was very capable of forming an opinion, and had given proof of no small discernment; was a

Digitized by Google

patron of learned men, and not personally disaffected to the Reformers. But the sins of the French people, and also of the King himself, on account of which the wrath of God then impended over them, did not allow him to hear of that work, far less to read it. Calvin, after publishing it, and thereby, as it were, performing his duty to his country, felt an inclination to visit the Duchess of Ferrara, a daughter of Louis XII., whose piety was then greatly spoken of, and, at the same time, pay his respects to Italy as from a distance. He accordingly visited the Duchess, and, in so far as the state of the times permitted, confirmed her in her zeal for true religion. She ever after had a great attachment to him while he was alive, and now surviving him, has recently given a strong proof of grateful respect to his memory.

Calvin left Italy, which he was wont to say he had only entered that he might be able to leave it, and returned to France. After settling his affairs, and taking with him Anthony Calvin, his only surviving brother, his purpose was to return to Bâsle or Strasburgh. Owing to the war, the other roads were shut up, and he was obliged to proceed through Switzerland. In this way he came to Geneva, having himself no thought of this city, but brought thither by Providence, as afterwards appeared. A short time before, the Gospel of Christ had been introduced in a wonderful manner into that city by the exertions of two most illustrious men, viz., William Farel from Dauphiny, (not a monk, as some have pretended, but a scholar of James Lefevre of Estaples,) and Peter Viret of Orb, in the territory of Berne and Friburgh, whose labours the Lord afterwards most abundantly blessed. Calvin having, in passing through Geneva, paid them a visit, as good men are wont to do to each other, Farel, a person

Digitized by Google

obviously inspired with a kind of heroic spirit, strongly urged him, instead of proceeding farther, to stay and labour with him at Geneva. When Calvin could not be induced to consent, Farel thus addressed him: "You are following only your own wishes, and I declare, in the name of God Almighty, that if you do not assist us in this work of the Lord, the Lord will punish you for seeking your own interest rather than his." Calvin, struck with this fearful denunciation, submitted to the wishes of the Presbytery and the Magistrates, by whose suffrage, the people consenting, he was not only chosen preacher, (this he had at first refused,) but was also appointed Professor of Sacred Literature—the only office he was willing to accept. This took place in August 1536; a year which is also remarkable for the strict alliance that was formed between the two cities of Berne and Geneva, and for the accession of Lausanne to the Reformation, after a free discussion with the Papists, in which Calvin took part.

At this time, Calvin published a short formula of Christian doctrine, adapted to the Church of Geneva, which had just escaped from the pollutions of the Papists. To this he appended a Catechism, not the one that we now have, in the form of question and answer, but another much shorter, containing only the leading heads of religion. Endeavouring afterwards, with Farel and Coral, to settle the affairs of the Church,—most of his colleagues, from timidity, keeping aloof from the contest, and some of them (this gave Calvin the greatest uneasiness) even secretly impeding the work of the Lord,—his first object was to obtain from the citizens, at a meeting attended by the whole body of the people, an open abjuration of the Papacy, and an oath of adherence to the Christian religion and its discipline, as comprehended under a few heads. Although not a few refused, as might have been

Digitized by Google

expected in a city which had just been delivered from the snares of the Duke of Savoy, and the yoke of Antichrist, and in which factions still greatly prevailed, yet by the good hand of the Lord, on the 20th of July 1537, (the clerk of the city taking the lead,) the senate and people of Geneva solemnly declared their adherence to the leading doctrines and discipline of the Christian religion. Satan, exasperated (but in vain) at these proceedings, and thinking that what he had attempted in an endless variety of ways, by foreign enemies, he might be able to accomplish under the cloak of piety, stirred up first the Anabaptists, and afterwards Peter Caroli, to attempt not only to interrupt, but even utterly to destroy and subvert, the work of the Lord. Of this Caroli, to whom this work was most disagreeable, both from its own nature, and because it interfered with views he was proved to have entertained, we will speak by and by. But, as the event showed, the Lord had anticipated Satan. For Calvin and his colleagues having brought the Anabaptists to free discussion in public, so thoroughly refuted them by the Word of God alone, on the 18th of March 1537, that, from that time, (a rare instance of success,) not above one or two appeared in that church.

Peter Caroli, the other disturber of the Church, occasioned greater and longer disturbance, but I will only give the leading heads, because a full history of the contest is extant, and may also be learned from a letter of Calvin to Grynæus. The Sorbonne, the mother who gave birth to this most impudent sophist, having afterwards thrown him off as a heretic, though he little deserved this at her hands, he went, first to Geneva, next to Lausanne, and afterwards to Neufchatel, the spirit of Satan so accompanying him, that in every place to which he came he left manifest traces of his turpitude. Finding himself discovered by our people,

Digitized by Google

he went over to the enemy, and from the enemy again returned to us. His proceedings are well described by Farel in a long letter to Calvin. Ultimately he began to attack our best men, especially Farel, Calvin, and Viret, charging them with error on the subject of the Holy Trinity, and a very full synod having been held at Berne, P. Caroli was convicted of calumny. After this he went to Metz, suborned to impede the work of the Lord, which Farel had there happily commenced. Subsequently he wrote a letter, in which he openly attacked the Reformers, the object of the hungry dog evidently being to show his perfect readiness to apostatise, and thereby obtain some appointment. He was, however, dispatched to Rome, to give satisfaction in presence of the Beast herself, and being there received with mockery, pressed by poverty and a loathsome disease, he, with difficulty, got admission to an hospital, where he at last obtained from the Man of Sin the due reward of his iniquities, namely—death. Such was the end of this unhappy man.

Meanwhile, in the year 1537, Calvin, seeing many persons in France, though they had a thorough knowledge of the truth, yet consulting their ease, and holding it enough to worship Christ in mind, while they gave outward attendance on Popish rites, published two most elegant letters, one on Shunning Idolatry, addressed to Nicholas Chemin, whose hospitality and friendship he had enjoyed at Orleans, and who afterwards was appointed to an official situation in Lorraine, and the other, on the Popish Priesthood, addressed to Gerard Roussel, whom I mentioned before, and who being presented first to an abbacy, and thereafter to a bishoprick, when the Parisian disturbance was forgotten, not only failed to keep the straight course, but even gradually misled his mistress, the Queen of Navarre.

While Calvin was thus engaged, most grievous trials befel

Digitized by Google

him at home. The gospel had, as we have said, been admitted into the city, and Popery been abjured, but, at the same time, there were many who had not renounced the flagrant immoralities which had long prevailed in a city, subject for so many years to monks and a corrupt clergy; while old feuds, which had originated during the war of Savoy, between some of the first families, still subsisted. Calvin tried to remove these feuds, first by gentle admonition, and afterwards by graver rebuke; but both proved unavailing. The evil continued to increase,—so much so, that, through the factious proceedings of certain private individuals, the city was split into parties, not a few positively refusing, on any account, to conform to the order which they had sworn to observe. Matters came to such a pass, that Farel and Calvin, men endowed with a noble and heroic spirit, together with their colleague Corald, (he whom we formerly mentioned as having contended strenuously for the truth at Paris, and whom Calvin had brought first to Bâsle, and afterwards to Geneva, after he himself became stationed there,) openly declared, that they could not duly dispense the Lord's Supper to a people so much at variance among themselves, and so much estranged from all ecclesiastical discipline.

To this another evil was added, viz., a difference as to certain ritual matters between the Church of Geneva and that of Berne. The Genevese used common bread in the Lord's Supper. They had, besides, abolished what are called *baptisteries* as unnecessary for the performance of baptism, and also all feast days, with the exception of the Lord's day. The Synod of Lausanne, urged by the people of Berne, being decided in favour of unleavened bread, and of its restitution at Geneva, thought it only fair that the Consistory of Geneva should first be heard. For that purpose,

Digitized by Google

another synod was appointed to meet at Zurich. Availing themselves of these occasions, the ringleaders of faction and discord, who had been elected Syndics, (this is an annual appointment, and is the highest office in the magistracy in the Genevese Republic,) convened the people, and carried matters with so high a hand, (Calvin and three of his colleagues, who agreed with him in opinion, in vain offering to render an account of all their proceedings,) that the greater part overcoming the better, those three faithful servants of God were ordered to quit the city, within two days, for having refused to celebrate the Lord's Supper. This decision being intimated to Calvin, "Certainly," says he, "had I been the servant of men I had obtained a poor reward, but it is well that I have served Him who never fails to perform to his servants whatever he has promised." Who would not have supposed that these things would prove certain destruction to the Genevese Church? On the contrary, the event showed that the purpose of Divine Providence was partly, by employing the labours of his faithful servant elsewhere, to train him, by various trials, for greater achievements, and partly, by overthrowing those seditious persons, through their own violence, to purge the city of Geneva of much pollution. So admirable does the Lord appear in all his works, and especially in the government of his Church! This was fully manifested by what afterwards happened.

At that time, however, the three ministers having, in obedience to the edict, to the great grief of all good men, first proceeded to Zurich, and there, after holding a synod of certain of the Helvetic Churches, and by decree of the senate, attempted, through the mediation of the Bernese, but in vain, to conciliate the Genevese, Calvin proceeded to Bâsle, and shortly afterwards to Strasburgh. Having been appointed, with a competent salary,

Digitized by Google

to the chair of theology in that city, with the consent of the senate, by the distinguished men who shone like bright lights in that Church, viz., Bucer, Capito, Niger, and their colleagues, he not only taught theology, with the universal applause of the learned, but also, at the suggestion of the Council, laid the platform of the French Church, establishing also a form of ecclesiastical discipline. Thus, Satan, disappointed in his expectation, saw Calvin received elsewhere, and, as a substitute for the Genevan Church, another Church forthwith erected. The arch-enemy, however, still laboured, as assiduously as ever, to overthrow the Genevese edifice, which already threatened ruin in every part. He, accordingly, soon found certain evil-disposed persons, who, in order to cloak that most iniquitous decree with some pious pretext or other, proposed that unleavened bread should be substituted for the common bread which was formerly used in the Supper. The object was to obtain a handle for new disturbance. Nor would Satan have failed in this, had not Calvin earnestly exhorted some good men who were so offended at the change, that they were even proposing to abstain from the Supper altogether, not to stir up strife about an indifferent matter. The use of unleavened bread thus prevailed, and even Calvin, after he was restored, never thought of contesting the matter, though he was far from disguising that he would have liked much better it had been otherwise. But another evil, of a more dangerous description, arose in the year 1539, and was, at the same time, suppressed by the diligence of Calvin. The Bishop of Carpentras, at that time, was James Sadolet. He was a man of great eloquence, which he perverted, especially in suppressing the light of truth, and had been appointed a Cardinal, for no other reason than in order that his respectability as a man might serve to put a kind of gloss on false

Digitized by Google

religion. He then observing his opportunity in the circumstances which had occurred, and thinking that he would easily ensnare the flock, when deprived of its distinguished pastors, under the pretext of neighbourhood, (for the city of Carpentras is in Dauphiny, which again bounds with Savoy,) sent a letter to his, so-styled, most Beloved Senate, Council, and People of Geneva, omitting nothing which might tend to bring them back into the lap of the Romish Harlot. There was nobody at that time in Geneva capable of writing an answer, and it is, therefore, not unlikely, that, had the letter not been written in a foreign tongue, it would, in the existing state of affairs, have done great mischief to the city. But Calvin, having read it at Strasburgh, forgot all his injuries, and forthwith answered it with so much truth and eloquence, that Sadolet immediately gave up the whole affair as desperate. But, indeed, Calvin did not wait so long as this to testify the affection which, as a pastor, he still felt bound to cherish towards the Genevese, and towards his own friends, who were then enduring most grievous hardships in the common cause of piety. Of this affection a lively proof is exhibited in those letters which he addressed to them from Strasburgh, both on the very year of his expulsion, and also in the year after. The sole aim of those letters is to exhort them to repentance before God, and forbearance towards the wicked, to cultivate peace with their pastors, and, above all, to be earnest in prayer—in this way preparing them for that so much desired light, which it was hoped might yet arise out of the present fearful darkness, and which, eventually, and in a wonderful manner, did arise out of it.

At this time, also, he published a greatly enlarged edition of his Christian Institutes, and a Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, dedicated to his dear friend, Simon Grynée,

Digitized by Google

together with a little golden Treatise on the Lord's Supper, for the use of his countrymen the French. This was afterwards translated into Latin by Galars. The subject of the Lord's Supper is here expounded with so much ability and erudition, that a determination of those most unhappy controversies, in which all the learned and all the good deservedly acquiesced, is chiefly to be ascribed under God to that treatise. Nor had Calvin less success in bringing back many Anabaptists to the right path, and in particular two, the one, Paul Volse, to whom Erasmus had dedicated his Manual of a Christian Soldier, and whom the Church of Strasburgh afterwards enjoyed as its pastor; the other, John Storder of Liege, who afterwards died of the plague, and whose widow, Idelleta, a grave and honourable woman, Calvin married by the advice of Bucer.

These were Calvin's studies at Strasburgh until the year 1541, in which year the Emperor convened a Diet, first at Worms, and afterwards at Ratisbon, for the purpose of settling the differences in religion. This Diet, agreeably to the wish of the Theological Consistory of Strasburgh, Calvin attended, and, as it appears, not without great advantage to the churches, especially that of his native country, and to the great delight of Master Philip Melancthon and Gasper Cruciger, of blessed memory. The former often called Calvin the "Theologian," and the latter, after a private conference with him on the subject of the Supper, in which he was made acquainted with Calvin's opinion, distinctly approved of it.

But the time had arrived when the Lord had determined to take pity on the Church of Geneva. Accordingly, one of the Syndics, who had laboured to procure the decree by which the faithful pastors were ejected, so misconducted himself in the administration of the republic, that he was ac-

Digitized by Google

cused of sedition. Attempting to escape by a window, he fell, and being a large overgrown man, was so much injured, that he died a few days after. Another of them was executed for murder. Two others being accused of misconducting themselves on a certain embassy on which they had been sent by the Republic, took flight, and were condemned in absence. The city being thus rid of its filth and froth, began to long for its Farel and its Calvin. As there seemed very little hope of getting back Farel from Neufchatel, the State turns its whole attention to Calvin, and employing the mediation of Zurich, sends an embassy to Strasburgh to obtain the consent of the inhabitants to his return. These expressed great reluctance to part with him. Calvin himself, although the injuries which he had received at the instigation of certain wicked men, had made no change upon his affection for the Genevese, yet having an aversion to disturbances, and seeing that the Lord had blessed his ministry in the Church of Strasburgh, stated plainly that he would not return. Bucer also, and others, declared that they would have the greatest objection to part with him. The Genevese, however, persisting, Bucer came to be of opinion that their prayers should be complied with; but he never would have obtained Calvin's consent, had he not given warning of Divine judgment, and appealed to the example of Jonah. These things having occurred about the time when Calvin had to go with Bucer to the Diet of Ratisbon, (for so it had been determined,) his return was postponed, and the Genevese obtained the consent of the people of Berne, that Peter Viret, of Lausanne, should go for a short time and officiate at Geneva. This made Calvin the less reluctant to return, inasmuch as he was to have a colleague, whose aid and advice would be of the greatest use to him in restoring the Church. Accordingly, after the

Digitized by Google

lapse of several months, Calvin returned to Geneva on the 13th of September 1541, amid the congratulations of the whole people, and especially of the Senate, who then sincerely acknowledged the singular goodness of God towards them, and who never ceased to urge the people of Strasburgh to expunge a reservation which they had made, making the return only temporary. This they at length conceded, on condition, however, that the honorary freedom of the city which they had conferred on Calvin should remain unimpaired, and that he should continue to draw yearly what they call the *præbend.* The former condition Calvin approved, but being a person who had no desire whatever for wealth, he could never be induced to accept the latter.

Calvin being thus restored at the urgent entreaty of his Church, proceeded to set it in order. Seeing that the city stood greatly in need of a curb, he declared, in the first place, that he could not properly fulfil his ministry, unless, along with Christian doctrine, a regular presbytery with full ecclesiastical authority were established. At that time, therefore, (but this matter will be more fully explained farther on,) laws for the election of a presbytery, and for the due maintenance of that order, were passed, agreeably to the Word of God, and with the consent of the citizens themselves. These laws Satan afterwards made many extraordinary attempts to abolish, but without success. Calvin also wrote a Catechism in French and Latin, not at all differing in substance from the former one, but much enlarged, and in the form of question and answer. This may well be termed an admirable work, and has been so much approved in foreign countries, that it has not only been translated into a great number of living languages, such as the German, English, Scotch, Flemish, and Spanish, but also into Hebrew by Emanuel Tremmellius, a Christian Jew, and most elegantly

Digitized by Google

into Greek by Henry Stephen. What his ordinary labours at this time were will be seen from the following statement. During the week he preached every alternate and lectured every third day, on Thursday he met with the Presbytery, and on Friday attended the ordinary Scripture meeting, called "The Congregation," where he had his full share of the duty. He also wrote most learned Commentaries on several of the books of Scripture, besides answering the enemies of religion, and maintaining an extensive correspondence on matters of importance. Any one who reads these attentively, will be astonished how one man could be fit for labours so numerous and so great. He availed himself much of the aid of old Farel and Viret, while, at the same time, he was also of great service to them. This friendship and intimacy was not less hateful to the wicked than delightful to all the pious, and, in truth, it was a most pleasing spectacle to see and hear those three distinguished men, carrying on the work of God so harmoniously, and yet differing so much from each other in the nature of their gifts. Farel excelled in a certain sublimity of mind, so that nobody could either hear his thunders without trembling, or listen to his most fervent prayers without feeling almost as it were carried up into heaven. Viret possessed such winning eloquence, that his entranced audience hung upon his lips. Calvin never spoke without filling the mind of the hearer with most weighty sentiments. I have often thought that a preacher compounded of the three would have been absolutely perfect.

To return to Calvin,—in addition to these employments, he had many others, arising out of circumstances domestic and foreign. For the Lord so blessed his ministry, that persons flocked from all parts of the Christian world, some to take his advice in matters of religion, and others to hear him. Hence,

Digitized by Google

we have seen an Italian, an English, and, finally, a Spanish Church at Geneva, one city seeming scarcely sufficient to entertain so many guests. But though at home he was courted by the good, and feared by the bad, and matters had been admirably arranged, yet there were not wanting individuals who gave him great annoyance. These disputes we will explain in order, that posterity may have a singular example of fortitude, which each may imitate according to his ability.

To resume our narrative, as soon as he returned to the city, calling to mind the saying, (Matth. vi. 33,) "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all other things will be added unto you," the first thing he did was to obtain the consent of the Senate to a form of ecclesiastical polity, which was agreeable to the Word of God, and from which neither ministers nor people should afterwards be permitted to depart. The form which had been formerly approved was hated by some among the common people, and also by some of the leading citizens, who, though they had renounced the Pope, had assumed the name of Christ in name only. Some also of the ministers who had remained in the city when these good men were driven out of it, (the chief of them, indeed, being afterwards accused of flagrant misconduct, had basely deserted their posts,) although they did not dare to resist the testimony of their conscience, yet secretly opposed it, not easily allowing themselves to be reduced into order. Nor did they want a pretext for their malice, viz., the example of other Churches in which there was no excommunication. In short, there were not wanting some who cried out that a Popish tyranny was re-established. But Calvin's firmness, combined with singular moderation, overcame these difficulties. He demonstrated that not only doctrines, but also the form

Digitized by Google

of Church government, must be sought for in Scripture, and appealed, in support of his views, to the expressed opinion of the most distinguished men of the age, as Œcolampadius, Zuinglius, Zuichius, Philip, Bucer, Capito, and Myconius; still not condemning as antichristian those Churches which had not proceeded the same length, or those pastors who thought that their flocks did not require to be so curbed. In fine, he demonstrated how great the difference was between Popish tyranny and the yoke of the Lord. In this way he was successful in getting those laws of ecclesiastical polity, which that Church still observes, to be drawn up with universal consent, read over, and finally approved by the suffrages of the people, on the 20th of November.

Although these things had been happily begun, yet as Calvin perceived that they could not be carried into practice without considerable difficulty, he felt exceedingly desirous that Viret, whom the Bernese had only parted with for a time, and Farel, whom the inhabitants of Neufchatel had received on his ejection, should be appointed his perpetual colleagues. In this, however, he did not succeed, Viret having shortly after returned to Lausanne, and Farel again fixed his residence at Neufchatel. Hence the merit of restoring the Genevan Church is almost entirely due to Calvin alone. In the following year, (1542,) Calvin had no few sources of annoyance. For, in addition to those which he had at home, the inflamed fury of the enemies of the gospel expelling numbers of persons from France and Italy, and bringing them into a neighbouring city of so much celebrity, it is wonderful with what zeal he exerted himself to counsel and refresh the exiles, by every kind of attention, to say nothing of the letters which he wrote for the consolation of those who continued in the very lion's

Digitized by Google

jaws. The same year, two very grievous evils were added, viz., a scarcity of corn, and its usual attendant the plague. At that time the custom in Geneva was, to send those suffering by the plague to an hospital outside the city. But as the assistance of a steady and careful pastor was required, and the greater part declined from fear of infection, three volunteered themselves, viz., Calvin, Sebastian Castellio, (of whom we will afterwards speak,) and Peter Blanchet. Lots were cast, but when the lot fell upon Castellio, he changed his mind, and impudently declined to undertake the office. Calvin wished to do it, but the Senate interposing to prevent him, Blanchet, who still volunteered, was appointed. Other grievous evils also occurred at this time. For Peter Toussain, a pastor of Montbelliard, revived the controversy concerning the Lord's Supper, while, at Bâsle, there were not wanting persons who, notwithstanding of the opposition of Myconius, sought to overthrow the foundations of ecclesiastical discipline before they were well laid. Two conferences were held with Calvin on the subject. At Metz, where Farel, who had been invited thither, was labouring with great success, the work of the Lord was greatly impeded, partly by the apostate Peter Caroli, whom we have already mentioned. How much Calvin laboured on these occasions, by writing, admonishing, exhorting, &c., may be understood from his published letters, and is also attested by many still in manuscript.

But the Sorbonne, growing more audacious than they had ever been before, in consequence of the patronage of Peter Liser, President of the Parliament of Paris, (a man whose memory is still in detestation,) ventured on an attempt, at which the Bishops, or at least the Pope himself, would scarcely have connived, had they not been oc-

Digitized by Google

cupied in dividing the spoils of the Church among themselves, in the manner in which robbers are wont to do, and so leaving their own special duty of administering the word to be performed by those worthies whom they call doctors; on the same terms, however, on which dogs serve their masters, viz., the being permitted to gnaw the bones which come from the table, after being exceedingly well-picked. The Sorbonne then, supported by no authority human or divine, had dared to prescribe articles of Christian faith, and of such a kind, that both by their falsehood and by the extreme childishness so common to that body, they must have lost all authority with men not utterly devoid of sense. Many, however, came forward to subscribe them—some through fear and others through ignorance. Calvin, therefore, wrote an answer, in which, with great learning and solid argument, he refuted their errors, and wittily exposed their folly to the derision of all not absolutely stupid. In this manner that year passed away, and the next (1543) was in no respects of a milder nature. The same evils, viz., scarcity of corn and the plague, raging in Savoy, Calvin again exerted himself at home in confirming his people, and abroad, in strenuously opposing the enemies of the Church. This he did, especially by the publication of four books on the controversy relating to free-will. These, which he dedicated to Philip Melancthon, were in answer to Albert Pighius of Campen, who was the first sophist of the age, and had selected Calvin for an antagonist, in the hope, that, by gaining a distinguished victory, he might obtain a Cardinal's hat from the Pope. But his labour proved vain. The only thing he obtained was just what the enemies of the truth deserve,—he excited the disgust of all men of sense and learning, and was deceived by Satan himself. Philip (Melancthon) has declared how

Digitized by Google

high a value he set upon these books, by his letter which we thought it right to publish, in order that posterity might have a sure and clear testimony with which to refute the calumniators of both.

From a letter which Calvin himself addressed in the same year to the Church of Montbelliard, any person may know what answer to give to those who complain of his excessive severity in enforcing the laws of ecclesiastical polity. The following year was 1544, in course of which, Calvin explained his opinion of the course pursued by the people of Neufchatel in the matter of ecclesiastical censures. But at home, Sebastian Castellio, to whose levity we have already adverted, and who, though he had an air of mock humility, yet, from his most absurd ambition, plainly belonged to the class of people whom the Greeks call ἰδιογνωμονες, (wise in their own conceit,) being filled with indignation, because Calvin had not approved of his sillinesses in the French translation of the New Testament, effervesced to such a degree, that, not contented with teaching certain strange doctrines, he publicly insisted that Solomon's Song should be expunged from the Canon, as impure and obscene. When the ministers refused to comply, he assailed them with the bitterest reproaches. Justly thinking that such conduct was not to be borne, they called him before the Senate on the 30th of June, when, after a most patient hearing and full discussion, he was convicted of calumny, and ordered to quit the city. How he conducted himself after going to Bâsle, where he was at length admitted, will be described elsewhere.

The year before, Charles V. having, in the view of turning all his strength against the French, promised the Germans, that for a short period, until a General Council were held, which he engaged to see done, neither party should suffer

Digitized by Google

prejudice on account of religious differences, but both enjoy equal laws, the Roman Pontiff, Paul III., was exceedingly offended, and addressed a very severe expostulation to the Emperor, because, forsooth, he had put heretics on a footing with Catholics, and, as it were, put his sickle into another man's corn. Cæsar gave what answer seemed proper, but Calvin, because the truth of the gospel, and the innocence of the godly, was deeply injured by that letter, repressed the audacity of the Pontiff. A diet of the empire was at this time held at Spires, and Calvin, availing himself of the occasion, published a short treatise on the Necessity of Reforming the Church. I know not if any writing on the subject, more nervous or solid, has been published in our age. The same year, Calvin, in two short treatises, so effectually refuted both the Anabaptists and the Libertines, (in whom all the most monstrous heresies of ancient times were renewed,) that I believe no one who reads them attentively will ever be deceived by these people, unless it be with his eyes open, or if he have been deceived, will not forthwith return to the right path. The treatise against the Libertines, however, gave offence to the Queen of Navarre, because (the thing is almost incredible) she had been fascinated to such a degree by two ringleaders of that horrible sect, viz., Quintin and Pocquet, on whom Calvin had expressly animadverted, that, although she did not embrace their heresy, she held them to be good men, and therefore thought herself, in a manner, stabbed through their side. When Calvin understood this, he replied to her with admirable moderation, as became her rank, and the remembrance of the benefits which she had conferred upon the Church of Christ, and yet ingenuously and frankly, as became a faithful servant of God, censuring her im-

Digitized by Google

prudence, in receiving men of such a character, and asserting the authority of his ministry. In short, it was owing to him, that the professors of this horrid sect of Libertines, who had begun to spread as far as France, afterwards kept within the confines of Holland, and the adjacent provinces.

While Calvin was worn out with all the labours of this year, the following year (1545) commenced with contests, and these by far the most grievous in which he had been involved. For, as if the plague sent from heaven had not sufficiently exhausted the city and its neighbourhood, avarice prevailed to such a degree in some poor wretches, whom the richer class had employed to take care of the sick, and purify their houses, that having entered into a horrid conspiracy together, they besmeared the door-posts and thresholds, and all the passages of houses, with a pestilential ointment, which immediately produced a dreadful plague. They had come under a solemn oath to each other to become the bond-slaves of Satan, in the event of being induced, by any tortures, to betray their accomplices. Not a few, however, were apprehended, as well in the city as in the neighbouring districts, and suffered condign punishment. It is almost incredible how much obloquy Satan, by this device, brought upon Geneva, and especially on Calvin, people believing that the arch-enemy was obviously reigning in the very place, where, in truth, he was most powerfully opposed.

This year was also infamous for that savage butchery which the parliament of Aix committed on the Waldensian brethren of Merindol and Cabrier, and the whole of that district, not on one or two individuals, but on the whole population, without distinction of age or sex, burning down their villages also. These ca-

Digitized by Google

lamities affected Calvin the more deeply, when consoling and refreshing a few who had taken refuge in Geneva, because he had formerly taken care by letters, and by supplying them with pastors, to have them purely instructed in the Gospel; and when they had been brought into jeopardy on a former occasion, had saved them by interceding for them with the princes of Germany and the Swiss Cantons. At this time also, that unhappy dispute concerning the Lord's Supper again crept in, Osiander, a man of haughty and extravagant temper, stirring up the smothered embers. It certainly was not Calvin's fault that this fire was not extinguished. In proof of this, we have published several of the letters which he wrote to Melancthon. But the intemperance of that man, whom both Calvin and Melancthon surnamed Pericles, left no room for their sound advice. Meanwhile, the plague raging in the city carried off many good men. Calvin did his utmost in thundering from the pulpit against the flagitious lives of certain individuals, and especially against their whoredom, from which they could not even then desist. In this all good men concurred with him, though there were some demagogues who resisted his attempts, until such time as they brought ruin upon themselves, in the manner which will be explained in its own place. To these evils were added unseasonable disputes concerning the rights of citizenship. There were also disputes concerning the ecclesiastical revenues, which had been carried off by the Papists, and which the faithful pastors could not allow to be administered so improperly, as they were in many places. These disputes occasioned much noise, much complaint, and much labour, in speaking and writing, but generally to no purpose—Calvin openly declaring, that he certainly had not the least favour for the numerous acts of sacrilege, which he felt assured that Heaven would one day punish

Digitized by Google

most severely, but declaring also, that he acknowledged the just judgment of God in not allowing the revenues, which formerly had been so iniquitously acquired by the priesthood, to be brought into the treasury of the Church.

Calvin had, moreover, this same year, a double cause of anxiety both at home and abroad. An individual, old in wickedness, though still young in years, having returned to Geneva, his native place, after he had for some time counterfeited the hermit in France, began with making a great profession of piety. Calvin, who was a sagacious and skilful judge of character, if ever any man was, soon saw through him, and began to admonish him; gently at first, but by and by more freely, and after he had given himself a great many airs before the congregation, to rebuke him openly. He, enraged at this, easily finds out persons against whose iniquities Calvin had been wont to inveigh, and who were quite ready to assist him with their influence and their zeal. Accordingly, when it became necessary to supply a vacancy in the pastoral office, caused by the death of a pastor, he, with his adherents, openly intrigued for it. But why enter more into detail? The Senate interposing its authority, orders him to be taken on trial. Calvin, with his colleagues, resisted, and showing how repugnant his intriguing for the office was to the Word of God, succeeded in obtaining the concurrence of the Senate to maintain the ecclesiastical laws as they had been enacted. At this time also there were some persons in France who, having fallen away at first from fear of persecution, had afterwards begun to be so satisfied with their conduct as to deny that there was any sin in giving bodily attendance on Popish rites, provided their minds were devoted to true religion. This most pernicious error, which had been condemned of old by the Fathers, Calvin refuted with the greatest clearness, though, as they alleged, with too

Digitized by Google

much severity, adding the opinions of the most learned theologians, Philip Melancthon, Bucer, Peter Martyr, and the church of Zurich. The consequence was, that from that time the name of Nicodemite was held in detestation by all good men. This name of Nicodemite was applied to those who pretended to find a sanction for their misconduct in the example of that most holy man Nicodemus.

The succeeding year (1546) was in no respect milder than its predecessor. For while it was necessary to confirm the minds of the citizens against frequent rumours of preparations which the Emperor was said to be making against religion, and against the wiles of the Pope, who was said to have incendiaries in his pay, the state of the city was particularly deplorable in this respect, that the petulance of the wicked, so far from being tamed by the many chastisements they had received, on the contrary, continued to increase, and at length broke out openly. For they had obtained for their leader one Ami Perrin, an exceedingly foolish, but daring and ambitious man, (whom, for this reason, Calvin in his letters nicknames the "Comic Cæsar,") and who some time before had succeeded in getting the people to vote him into the office of Captain-General. Thinking, as he well might, that himself, and those like himself, could have no footing while the laws were in vigour, and especially while Calvin was constantly thundering against their licentiousness, he began at length, in this year, openly to show what he and his faction were meditating. This being at once rebuked and repressed by the authority of the senate, he became silent, indeed, but in a manner which more clearly betrayed his dishonesty. For a short time after, at a pretty full meeting of the senate, one of the members, secretly instigated, it is supposed, by two ministers of the Consistory, both of them given to drunkenness,

Digitized by Google

and not less afraid than others of the rigour of the law, accuses Calvin of preaching false doctrine. Calvin gave himself no trouble with this barking dog, who was, however, put upon his trial, and after due investigation convicted of calumny. The two false pastors in league with him were deposed, and even the tippling-houses were interdicted; so far were these bad men from succeeding in their malice. But the fire which had been suppressed this year blazed forth in that which succeeded, viz., 1547. Nor did any year of that age prove more calamitous. The churches of Germany were reduced to such extremity, that some of the princes and cities surrendered voluntarily, and others of them were taken by force, so that the structure which had been reared in the course of so many years, and after so great exertions, seemed to be in one moment overthrown. Those were generally considered most happy who, by an opportune death, had been delivered from these disasters. In this calamitous condition of the churches, we may easily suppose how that pious breast was tormented, which, even when in the enjoyment of peace itself, felt as much for the remotest churches, as if the whole burden of them had been entrusted to its care. How could it be otherwise? What pain must he have felt when he saw the most distinguished men, his dearest friends, I mean Melancthon, Bucer, and Martyr, in such peril, that they were more in death than in life! But that the strong mind of Calvin rose above these storms, is both attested by his writings, and was also proved by his conduct. At home, when vexed to the utmost by the wicked, he did not turn from his course so much as a hairbreadth.

To return to domestic strife; his sole object being to show that the gospel which he preached did not consist in mere speculation, but in Christian practice, he, of course, expe-

Digitized by Google

rienced the hostility of those who had declared war against all piety, and, in short, against their country itself. The chief of these, as I have already observed, was Perrin. His condition, and that of his party, was such, that they were determined at all hazards to insist that the cognisance of all matters of discipline should be transferred from the Presbytery to the Senate. The Presbytery, on the contrary, maintained that the laws enacted relative to ecclesiastical discipline were agreeable to the Word of God, and therefore implored the assistance of the Senate, to prevent the church from suffering harm. The Senate decided that the ecclesiastical laws were to be enforced, and passed an enactment to that effect. At last Perrin having, by his audacity, brought himself into the greatest jeopardy, the result of the whole affair was, that he was expelled from the senate, and deprived of his office of captain, and reduced to the rank of a private citizen. But though all these things were transacted in open court, it is impossible to describe the trouble which they gave to Calvin. Indeed, on one occasion, in the Court of the Two Hundred, the quarrel rose to such a height that they were on the point of drawing their swords, and staining the court itself with mutual slaughter. During the disturbance, Calvin coming in with his colleagues, suppressed it, though at the risk of his life, as the factious proceedings of these men were directed specially against him. He proceeded, nevertheless, to express his utter detestation of their crimes, and rebuked them with the severity which they deserved. Nor did his denunciation of Divine judgment prove vain. For about this time, one of them having been detected to have written, and to have fixed to the pulpit, an infamous libel, in which, along with many nefarious attacks on the sacred ministry, it was said that Calvin ought to be thrown

Digitized by Google

headlong into the Rhone, was, after due investigation, unexpectedly found guilty of an infinite number of other blasphemies, and punished with death. Nay, after his execution, a book was found in his own handwriting, expressly attacking Moses, and even Christ himself. It, moreover, appeared that he had succeeded in infecting others with his horrid impiety. In this year, amid all these contentions, Calvin wrote his Antidote to the Seven Sessions of the so-called Council of Trent, and also by letter confirmed the church of Rouén, in opposition to the fraudulent proceedings of a certain Franciscan, who had begun to spread the poisonous errors of Carpocrates, as renewed by the Libertines.

In the following year, viz., 1548, the old faction again burst forth, Satan, for that purpose, (the thing is almost incredible,) making use especially of the very persons who were most desirous of suppressing it; I mean Farel and Viret. They having arrived at Geneva at the beginning of the year, had delivered formal addresses in the Senate, with a view to the settlement of the prevailing dissensions, Calvin merely insisting on a reformation of manners, while Perrin and his party were willing to make any concession, for the purpose of reinstating him in his former situation. At this time every thing appeared settled, but the result shortly proved that these good men had merely been duped. Perrin being restored, the malignity of the wicked rose to such a height, that some of them openly used collars cut into the form of a cross, for the purpose of mutual recognition, while others gave the name of Calvin to their dogs, or playing upon the name, changed Calvin into Cain. Finally, not a few, from enmity to him, declared that they would not join in the Lord's Supper. All these proceedings were sharply rebuked by him and his colleagues, and the parties

Digitized by Google

being brought before the Senate, the good cause easily prevailed. Ultimately, on the 18th of December, the amnesty was again ratified by solemn oath. But in Perrin and his party all these things were mere pretence; their only object being, as the event proved, to procure the Syndicate for him, and so furnish them with the means of doing more mischief. During all this strife, not only was Calvin not idle, but, as if he had been living in retirement, wrote most learned commentaries on six of Paul's Epistles, and in a most solid treatise refuted what is called the Interim, (which had been published for the purpose of corrupting the German churches,) and pointed out the true method of renewing the Church. Lastly, in a very elegant little treatise he exposed the falsehood and vanity of what is called Judicial Astrology, in which not a few seemed to put too much faith. At this time, also, having been written to by Brentius, who was living in exile at Bâsle, he returned an answer, condoling with him in the most friendly terms. I wish Brentius had continued this connection. He also wrote to Bucer, who was then in exile in England, candidly exhorting him to write and speak more clearly on the subject of the Lord's Supper; and at the same time expressing the greatest sympathy with him. At the same time, in a carefully written letter, addressed to the Duke of Somerset, Protector of England, who was afterwards most unjustly put to death, he gave a warning, which, if it had been duly attended to, might, perhaps, have enabled the Church of England to escape many storms.

During these contests the Church of Geneva wonderfully increased. This, as it exceedingly vexed Satan and the wicked, so it put Calvin in greater spirits to entertain those who were living in exile for the cause of Christ. His anxiety on this head was so favoured of the Lord in the following year, that the rage of the wicked, though not altogether ex-

Digitized by Google

tinguished, seemed, at least, to be temporarily suppressed. And, in truth, he stood in need of a truce, the more especially that he had sustained a grievous domestic calamity, in the death of his most excellent wife. This affliction he bore with a firmness which made him in this respect also a shining example to the whole Church. In this year, (1549,) a dispute having arisen in the Saxon churches, concerning matters of indifference, called *Adiaphora*, Calvin being asked for his advice, gave a candid statement of his sentiments to Philip Melancthon, and at the same time reminded him of his duty. Some accused Melancthon of being too easy in this matter, but undeservedly, as Calvin was afterwards convinced on more accurate information. For it was not known at the time what was the spirit which animated the evil genius of Flacius and his whole tribe, who afterwards produced such disturbances, and even now impede the work of the Lord, assuredly with no less impudence and fury than if they were actually in the pay of the Roman Pontiff. But the wound thus inflicted on the German churches the Lord compensated, on the other hand, by his kindness to the Swiss.

Some having thought that Calvin was countenancing the doctrine of consubstantiation, he and Farel set out together for Zurich, in order to give a full explanation of the matter, and settle it with the common consent of all the Swiss churches. Good men and those who love truth had no difficulty in coming to an agreement. And, accordingly, a Confession was drawn up with the perfect approbation of all the Swiss and Rhætian churches. This Confession knit Bulinger and Calvin, and the churches of Zurich and Geneva in the closest ties. It is the Confession we all still hold, and I hope will, with the favour of God, continue to hold even to the end. This year, when

Digitized by Google

compared with others, passed away happily, and I have the greater pleasure in remembering it, because it was that in which I first entered on my ministerial functions, in consequence of a call given me by the Church of Lausanne, and urged on my acceptance by Calvin. About this time Calvin wrote two very learned letters to Lælius Socinus of Sienna, who long lived at Zurich, and ultimately died there. From these letters any one will easily discern what the temper of that man was,—obviously that of an academic, although it was long (indeed not till after his death) before the fact was fully established. He had travelled over the churches, and imposed on all their most learned men, more especially Melancthon, Calvin, and Joachim Camerarius, who, in his Life of Melancthon, bears very honourable testimony to him, contrary to his deserts. It was afterwards discovered that he was the chief author of the Bellian farrago, of which we will speak in its own place, and favoured the mad dogmas of Servetus, Castellio, and Ochin. In his Commentary on the celebrated First Chapter of John, which is still extant, he went far beyond the impiety of other heretics.

The following year, viz., 1550, in so far as regards the Church, was tranquil enough, and therefore it was determined that the ministers should at a certain season of the year, attended by an elder and a deacon, go round all the wards of the city, to instruct the people, and examine every individual briefly as to his faith. This they were to do, not only in sermons, which some neglected, and others attended, without much benefit, but also in each house and family. It is scarcely credible how great benefit ensued. Another arrangement was, that the celebration of our Saviour's nativity should be deferred to the Sabbath-day following, and that there should be no other feast-days, except one in seven, which we call the Lord's Day. This gave of-

Digitized by Google

fence to a very great number of persons, so that there were not wanting some who gave out that even the Lord's Day was suppressed by Calvin. Their object was to bring odium upon him, although the fact was, that the matter had been discussed before the people, not only in the absence of any request from the Consistory, but even without their knowledge. Calvin, however, did not think it worth while to make a quarrel about it; but the offence which some had taken at Calvin was the occasion of his writing his treatise "On Offences," dedicated to his old and faithful friend, Lawrence Normand.

The dissensions of the following year, viz., 1551, far more than overbalanced the two years of tranquillity. For besides the grief occasioned to the whole Church, and particularly to Calvin, by the death of Bucer, to whom he was very strongly attached, and also by the death of Joachim Vadian, consul of St Gal, a man of singular piety and learning, the wickedness of the factious broke out the more furiously the longer it had been smothered; in so much that they openly refused to confer the freedom of the city on the exiles who had arrived in it. Not contented with this, they jostled Calvin himself, as he was returning, after having preached on the other side of the Rhone; and almost threw Raymond his colleague into the river, as he was one night passing the bridge, by secretly removing one of the props. In fine, they stirred up no small tumult in the church of St Jervas, because the minister refused to give the name of Balthasar to a child which had been presented for baptism—that name being for a certain reason prohibited by an express law. Calvin had nothing to oppose to these evils but strong and invincible patience; for about this time another new evil assailed the Genevese Church.

The occasion of it was furnished by one Jerome Bolsec, a

Digitized by Google

monk of the order of Carmelites, from Paris, from which he had fled several years before. He had cast away his cowl, but retained his monkism, and having been also, for imposition, turned adrift by the Duchess of Ferrara, was converted into a physician in the course of three days. Having come to Geneva, and found there was no room for him among the learned physicians of that place, in order to show that he was a divine, he began to babble out errors and absurdities concerning predestination. This he at first did in private to certain individuals, but at length even in public before the congregation. Calvin had at first refuted him, and been contented to give him a gentle reprimand; and afterwards sending for him endeavoured to teach him the true doctrine. But either owing to the monkish ambition engrained in his nature, or spurred on by factious individuals, who were looking out for some one through whom they might assail Calvin, he openly dared, in presence of the congregation, when that passage of John was expounded, "He who is of God heareth the words of God; and in that you hear not, ye are not of God," to bring forward free-will, and the foresight of works, in order to subvert the doctrine of an eternal decree of predestination prior in order to all other causes whatever. He even added insult and mere seditious invective against the true doctrine.

He is thought to have acted with the greater boldness, because, from not seeing Calvin in his place, he thought he was absent. And so, indeed, he was, at the commencement; but coming in after he had begun his harangue, had kept standing behind some other persons. The monk's oration being ended, Calvin suddenly appeared, and although it was obvious he had nothing premeditated, he certainly then showed, if ever, what kind of man he was. For he so confuted, mauled, and overwhelmed him with proofs

Digitized by Google

from Scripture, quotations from authors, especially from Augustine, and, in fine, by numerous weighty arguments, that all felt exceedingly ashamed for the brasen-faced monk, except the monk himself. One of the judge's assessors, whose office it is to apprehend culprits in the city, happening to be among the hearers, when the meeting was dismissed lays hold of him, on a charge of sedition, and delivers him into custody. But why dwell upon it? After a long discussion, the Senate, having taken the opinion of the Swiss churches, on the 23d of December, publicly condemned him as a seditious man, and a mere Pelagian, and banished him the city, threatening him with scourging if he were again caught in it, or within its territory.

He afterwards went into a neighbouring town, and caused much disturbance, until he was twice expelled from the Bernese territory. He afterwards intrigued for a cure in the French Church, which he thought would then be at peace, and went first to Paris, and then to Orleans, making artful professions of repentance, and voluntarily begging to be reconciled to the Genevese Church. But when, contrary to his expectation, he perceived that the churches were in affliction, he went back to his medicine, and openly revolted to the enemies of the gospel, allowing his wife to become a prostitute to the canons of Augusta, where he is this good day assailing the truth, with whatever calumnies he can. Meanwhile, the Consistory of Geneva, at a public meeting, declared the true doctrine of predestination, and afterwards approved of it, as comprehended in a public document drawn up by Calvin. All that Satan gained by these dissensions was, that this article of the Christian religion, which was formerly most obscure, became clear and transparent to all not disposed to be contentious.

In the following year, (1552,) it became more apparent

Digitized by Google

how great a flame had been kindled by that worthless man, notwithstanding of his having been condemned by the common judgment of so many churches. For the mere difficulty of a question which had not been duly explained by most of the ancients, nor always discussed with the same result, incited curious minds in particular to engage in the discussion of it, while the factious thought an admirable opportunity was afforded them of throwing every thing into confusion, by getting Calvin expelled. Accordingly, it is impossible to describe the contentions which ensued, not only in the city, but also in every quarter, as if Satan himself had blown the trumpet. For although the pastors of the leading churches were admirably agreed, yet there were not wanting some in the churches bordering on the Bernese territory who would fain have picked a quarrel with Calvin, on the allegation that he made God the author of sin. Their memory must have been short, not to remember that this most pestilential dogma had been long ago refuted by Calvin, in his Treatise against the Libertines. But at Bâsle, that worthy and single-minded man, Castellio, although it was his wont to do every thing secretly, was open enough in his defence of Pelagianism. Nay, even Melancthon had begun to write on these matters in such terms, that though he had before distinctly subscribed to Calvin's Treatise against Pighius, he seemed to some to insinuate that the Genevese were introducing the fatalism of the Stoics. I say nothing of the Papists, who are even now repeating calumnies that have been a thousand times refuted. These things, as might have been expected, stung the mind of Calvin; and that the more keenly, that at this time the power of error was occasionally so strong, that truth seemed sometimes compelled, even by public authority, to shut her mouth.

Digitized by Google

The controversy thus raised was not short-lived; for in this very year the good hermit whom we have mentioned above came forth to dispute with Calvin. Some years before, having met with a repulse when he was intriguing for the ministry, he had turned lawyer, and taken the factious under his patronage. The matter was keenly discussed by the parties before the Senate; the hermit finding his armour in his impudence and the favour of the wicked, while Calvin, in defending his doctrine, trusted solely to the power of truth. Truth, therefore, prevailed; and the writings of Calvin were again approved as pious and orthodox, and, strange to say, by the suffrages even of his enemies. But we must not omit to mention the repentance which this enemy manifested some years after, and of which he was so desirous to have Calvin for a witness, that he said he could have no peace of conscience, unless he felt in his dying moments that Calvin, whom he acknowledged he had formerly unjustly assailed, was reconciled to him. This Calvin not only did not refuse, but consoled him in the kindest manner in his last moments.

The following year, viz., 1553, while the malice of the factious, which was hastening to its close, was so boisterous, that not only the Church, but even the Republic itself, was brought into extreme jeopardy, they proceeded to such lengths with clamour and menaces, and, in fine, by oppressing the liberty of the good, that they changed the ancient edicts with regard to the appointment of senators, (on this subject, the good afterwards took the greater care to provide for themselves, the Lord favouring them therein,) expelled some from the Senate, and pretending fear of the foreign exiles, deprived them of all weapons, except their swords, when they happened to go beyond the city; so that it seemed nothing could prevent them from accomplishing the

Digitized by Google

design for which they had long agitated, as they had every thing in their power. And even at this time Satan furnished them with another occasion. For that declared enemy of the sacred Trinity, that is, of the whole Godhead, and therefore a monster compounded of all heresies, however rank and portentous,—I mean Michael Servetus,—after he had wandered up and down for several years, professing medicine, concealing himself under the name of Michael Villanovanus, had circulated his blasphemies, which he afterwards published at Vienne in a thick volume. The printer was one Arnoldi, a bookseller in Lyons, and what is called the corrector for the press was one William Guerot, who had formerly been devoted to the factious among the Genevese, but a few months before had left Geneva for Lyons, to avoid punishment for fornication and other crimes. Servetus having published this large volume of blasphemy, and having, for that reason, been imprisoned at Vienne, escaped I know not how, and, by a kind of fatality, came to Geneva, intending to pass through it for some more distant place, had he not been providentially recognised by Calvin, to whom he was well known long before, and on his information to the magistracy consigned to prison. The contest which then arose, and the important matters to which they related, are most fully explained in a work published with that view. The result of the whole was, that this abandoned man, (into whose ear one of the factious, an assessor of the then Prætor, was said to have whispered something which confirmed him in his wickedness,) being betrayed by his own vain confidence, was convicted of impiety and endless blasphemies, conformably to the opinion of all the Swiss churches. On the 27th of October, the unhappy man, who gave no sign of repentance, was burned alive. In this year Farel was so seriously in-

Digitized by Google

disposed that Calvin, who went to Neufchatel to visit him, left him for dead. Contrary to all expectation he recovered, and was able shortly after to refresh the Church.

So far this year seems to have been divided between hope and fear, the former, however, prevailing in the end. But while the cause of Servetus was under discussion, one of the factious, Bertelier by name, a man of the most consummate impudence, whom the Presbytery, for his many iniquities, excluded from the Lord's Table, comes before the Senate, and prays to be absolved by their authority. Had this been done, there cannot be a doubt that the bond of ecclesiastical discipline being forthwith dissolved, everything would instantly have gone to wreck. Therefore Calvin, in name of the Presbytery, made strenuous and unremitting opposition, showing that magistrates ought to be the vindicators, not the destroyers, of sacred laws. In short, he omitted nothing which a contest of so much moment demanded. However, the false clamours of those who said that the Presbytery were in some things arrogating to themselves the authority of the magistrates prevailed, and it was, accordingly, resolved, in the Council of the Two Hundred, that, in excommunication, the ultimate right belonged to the Senate, who were entitled to absolve whom they pleased. In consequence of this resolution having been passed by the Senate, who had then given little attention to the subject, Bertelier surreptitiously obtained letters of absolution under the seal of the Republic. Perrin, with his followers, hoped that one of two consequences would follow—that if Calvin refused to obey the Senate, he would be able to overwhelm him by means of a mob; that if Calvin obeyed, he would have no difficulty in depriving the Presbytery of all authority, in other words, in removing every restraint upon wickedness.

But Calvin, though he had been informed of what was done

Digitized by Google

only two days before the usual period of celebrating the Lord's Supper, raising his voice and his hand in the course of his sermon, after he had spoken at some length of the despisers of sacred mysteries, exclaimed, in the words of Chrysostom, "I will die sooner than this hand shall stretch forth the sacred things of the Lord to those who have been judged despisers." These words, strange to say, had such an effect upon these men, however lawless, that Perrin secretly advised Bertelier not to come forward to the Table. The sacrament was celebrated with extraordinary silence, not without some degree of trembling, as if the Deity himself were actually present. In the afternoon Calvin, taking for his text the celebrated passage in the Acts of the Apostles, in which Paul bids farewell to the Church of Ephesus, declared that he was not a man who knew or taught others to fight against magistrates; and after exhorting his audience at great length to persevere in the doctrine which they had heard, as if it was the last sermon he was to deliver at Geneva, concluded thus:—"Since these things are so, allow me also, brethren, to use these words of the Apostle, 'I commend you to the Lord, and to the Word of his grace.'"

These words made a wonderful impression even on the most abandoned, while they, at the same time, seriously warned good men what their duty was. The next day Calvin, with his colleagues and the Presbytery, firmly demanded of the Senate, and also of the Two Hundred, that they should have an audience before the people, since the point under discussion related to the abrogation of a law which had been passed by the people. Their views having undergone no slight change, they came to be of opinion that the decree of the Two Hundred should be suspended—that the opinion of the four Swiss Cantons

Digitized by Google

should be taken, and that, in the meanwhile, no prejudice should be done to the existing laws.

In this way that storm was rather dispersed than calmed. For the factious seeing it, contrary to all expectation, averted from the head of Calvin, endeavoured to take advantage of a circumstance which had arisen to turn it upon the head of Farel. For Farel, who had been suffering by severe disease, in the month of March, hastening to Geneva as soon as his health permitted, and trusting partly to the goodness of the cause, and partly to his age, and the authority which he had long possessed in Geneva, delivered a sermon, in which he very sharply rebuked the factious. They, complaining that injustice was done them, cited him, after his return to Neufchatel, and obtained letters from the Senate to the inhabitants of that town, requesting them to allow Farel to appear on the day named in the citation. Farel accordingly came, though not without personal risk, the factious exclaiming that he deserved to be thrown into the Rhone. A right-hearted young man among the citizens, after warning Perrin again and again to take care that Farel, who was, as it were, the common father of the citizens, should suffer no harm, taking with him another young companion, gave information to others whom they knew to be well-affected. Accordingly, when Farel made his appearance in court, a great part of the city had assembled. The accusers, astonished, and now alarmed for their own safety, after Farel was heard, withdrew the accusation.

Thus the whole of this year was spent in contention with the wicked, and in defence both of doctrine and discipline, and everywhere with a prosperous issue, if we except the wound which not only England but all Christian churches received by the death of the most religious King Edward. Yet in this very year Calvin was so diligent a student that

Digitized by Google

he published his excellent Commentary upon John. I may here be permitted (I wish it were without cause) to say of Servetus, what the ancient Fathers, who spoke from experience, wrote concerning that twin monster, Paul Samosatenus and Arius of Alexandria, viz., that with them originated those fires by which the whole churches of Christendom were afterwards in a blaze. For punishment was most deservedly inflicted on Servetus at Geneva, not because he was a sectary, but a monstrous compound of mere impiety and horrid blasphemy, with which he had for the whole period of thirty years, by word and writing, polluted both heaven and earth. Even now it is impossible to say how much the influence of Satan has been increased by that flame which seized first upon Poland, then Transylvania and Hungary, and I fear may have proceeded farther still. Indeed, it would seem that Servetus prophesied under the influence of a Satanic spirit, when taking a passage of the Apocalypse and interpreting it in his usual way, he placed it in front of his book: "There was great war in heaven—Michael and his angels fighting with the dragon." This is, indeed, true if you give the word "*with*" not the meaning of the Greek κατα, (*against,*) but of συν, (*together with.*)

Scarcely, therefore, were the ashes of that unhappy man cold when questions began to be agitated concerning the punishment of heretics—some maintaining that they ought indeed to be coerced, but could not justly be put to death; others, as if the nature of heresy could not be clearly ascertained from the Word of God, or as if it were lawful to judge in academic fashion of all the heads of religion, maintaining that heretics ought to be left to the judgment of God only. This opinion was defended even by some good men, who were afraid that if a different view were

Digitized by Google

adopted they might seem to sanction the cruelty of tyrants against the godly. The chief abettors of that opinion (and they were thereby pleading their own cause) were Sebastian Castellio and Lælius Socinus; the latter, indeed, more secretly, but the former more openly, having in a certain treatise, which he prefixed to his translation, or rather perversion, of the sacred books, plainly studied to deprive the Divine Word of clear authority, and expressly maintained, in his Annotations on the First Epistle of Corinthians, as if for the express purpose of leading us away from the written Word as imperfect, that Paul had taught his perfect disciples—(who they were I know not)—a more recondite theology than he had delivered in his writings. Calvin having, in the beginning of the year 1544, drawn up a full refutation of the doctrine of Servetus, which was subscribed by all his colleagues; and having also added reasons, showing why and how far it was the duty of magistrates, after due investigation, to punish heretics, these men opposed him with a farrago, raked together partly from misquotations from the writings of pious doctors, and partly from the lucubrations of certain fanatics, otherwise of unknown name. The farrago bore to be written by one Martin Bellius. This was Castellio himself, although he afterwards swore it was not. The name of the town where it was said to be published was also fictitious. To that libellous production, containing not that error only, but teeming with many other blasphemies, I wrote an answer, with the view of relieving Calvin from the trouble, while occupied with far better business; I mean in writing his most learned Commentaries on Genesis and others, of which we will afterwards speak, and in warding off the dangers which threatened his church.

For the factious, who were bent on innovations, still proceeded; and though a second amnesty was solemnly ratified,

Digitized by Google

in presence of the Senate, in the month of February, yet their conduct every day became worse. Calvin was thus much occupied, both in endeavouring to bring them to a better mind, by rebuking them as he was wont, and in confirming the good, so as to enable them to withstand their wickedness; for to such lengths did the wicked proceed, that they transformed the Word of God into obscene songs, and beat any of the foreigners whom they met in the dark, and sometimes even robbed them. Privately, and appropriately, they called in the assistance of Bolsec, Castellio, and certain others, (men, no doubt, very solicitous for the truth!) to renew the controversy concerning predestination. Not contented with having circulated an infamous and anonymous libel, in which they offered the grossest insults to the faithful servant of God, Castellio caused another edition of it in Latin to be secretly printed at Paris. To this I afterwards replied; and Calvin himself also refuted certain frivolities on the subject, which had been drawn up under certain heads. His time was also at this period occupied by certain exiles from England, who had settled at Wesel, Embden, and Frankfort, and who were every now and then applying to Calvin for advice. Another thing which gave him not a little vexation, was the audacity of certain pastors (secretly aided by the favour of others) in the French Church of Strasburgh, which he himself had formerly planted. In short, the extent of his labours during this year, in behalf of various churches, is attested by the numerous letters by which he stirred up many men in power to embrace the gospel, and with the best results confirmed many of the brethren, some of whom were exposed to extreme peril, and others actually in bonds.

We formerly mentioned the consent of all the Swiss and Rhætian churches as to the doctrine of the sacrament, and its publication, to the great delight of all the learned and

Digitized by Google

good. This concord was displeasing to the spirit of error, whose great influence we have already seen. It was, therefore, easy to find out one who was willing to stir up the smothered embers. Accordingly, Joachim, a Westphalian, sounded the trumpet, which was afterwards echoed by Heshusius, then a minister of the Word, and now a bishop. We will speak of both by and by. An Exposition of the consent of the Churches, which Calvin published at this time, exasperated the rage of these men the more, the more profitable it proved to all the lovers of truth.

The following year, (1555,) by the wonderful goodness of God, put an end to domestic strife, and gave the Republic and Church of Geneva desired repose. The factious had ruined themselves by their own hands, a dreadful conspiracy having been very opportunely discovered, through the petulant audacity of certain of the conspirators when in a state of drunkenness. Some of them were capitally punished, and others exiled; and although the latter continued for some time after to trouble the State, they all at last came to a shameful end; thus affording a singular example of tardy, indeed, but still just punishment from God. No sooner was the republic thus freed from those pests, when, by another act of the Divine goodness, in consequence of the reply of the four Helvetian cities, (we mentioned that their opinion had on the previous year been asked by the Senate when making inquiry into the ecclesiastical discipline of Geneva,) all the ancient edicts relating to ecclesiastical polity were, contrary to the expectation of the factious, put to the vote, and carried by the common suffrages of the citizens. Calvin, however, did not want occasion for strenuous exertion. Abroad he was both engaged, at the request of the King of Poland, in establishing the churches of that kingdom, and also with that furious tempest produced by a change of affairs in

Digitized by Google

England, and by which those three bishops and martyrs of incomparable piety, John Hopper, Nicholas Ridley, and Hugh Latimer, with others almost innumerable, and at last also the great Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, were driven to heaven. He also exerted himself greatly in consoling his brethren who were in bonds in France, and especially five most devoted martyrs who were this year burned with the greatest cruelty at Cambray.

At home the ashes of Servetus began again to sprout one Matthew Gribald, a lawyer of some eminence, being detected favouring his blasphemies. He had accidentally come to Geneva, (he was the owner of Fargias, a village in the neighbourhood of Geneva,) and been introduced to Calvin by certain Italians, who had been his pupils at Padua. Calvin, however, refusing to give him the right hand of fellowship unless they were previously agreed as to the primary article of the Christian faith, viz., the Holy Trinity, left no room for admonition or argument. Accordingly, he afterwards experienced that of which Calvin even then forewarned him, viz., that the heavy judgment of God was impending over him for his obstinate impiety. He first fled to Tubingen, where he had been introduced by the favour of Vergerius, and being afterwards taken up at Berne, was liberated on abjuring his heresy. Returning again to his former course, and becoming the patron and host of Gentilis, of whom we will speak by and by, he was at last seized with the plague, and in that way anticipated the punishment which otherwise awaited him.

Another circumstance which occurred this year did not allow Calvin's joy to be complete. A faction, composed of a few neighbouring ministers, who in themselves felt inclined to oppose Calvin, and were, moreover, instigated by Bolsec,

Digitized by Google

to gain some degree of reputation, by attacking an individual so celebrated, men, moreover, whose characters had already many stigmas attached to them, raged like Bacchanalians against him, alleging that he made God the author of evil, by excluding nothing from His eternal providence and ordination. These calumnies, to which we have already alluded, although they did not move him from his course, yet, from the slanderous manner in which they were urged, obliged him to obtain permission from the Senate to proceed to Berne with deputies, and plead the cause of truth before the Bernese themselves. The cause was accordingly pleaded; the result being, that Sebastian was convicted of infamy, and banished, and Bolsec also was ordered to leave the country; but it was not thought proper to give any express decision on the subject itself. The Lord thus consulted for the good of his Church. Had a decision been given, Calvin might have seemed to have obtained, by authority and influence, that which he afterwards obtained voluntarily. For not long after, (not, however, till Calvin's death,) all those calumnies vanished into smoke, and Andrew Zebedee, the bitterest of the accusers, when on his death-bed, in the town of Newburgh, about four miles distant from Geneva, sending for the principal citizens, made a voluntary confession of the truth which he had opposed, and in detestation of his own conduct, ordered all his papers to be burned in their presence. This was assuredly a better decision in Calvin's favour, than if it had been given by a thousand decrees of the Senate.

In the following year, (1556,) Calvin, while preaching, was suddenly seized with ague, and ultimately obliged to leave the pulpit. Many false rumours arose on the subject, and the Papists were so delighted, that during public service at Noyon, Calvin's native city, the monks gave thanks to their idols for his death. But the prayers of the good

Digitized by Google

prevailed; and so far was Calvin from dying of this attack, that, on the contrary, as if he had renewed his strength, he undertook an unusually long journey, viz., to Frankfort, whither he had been invited, in order to allay the dissensions which had arisen in the French church. On his return, (1557,) although still weakly in health, he, however, omitted none of his daily labours, and published in the following year his most learned Commentaries on the Psalms, with a truly valuable preface. Part of this year, which was very turbulent, in consequence of tumults excited by some of these factious ministers, and distressing from the dearness of corn, he spent in maintaining the truth against Joachim the Westphalian. After he had written his last answer to the Westphalian, who, however, continued his endless prating, I took the task upon myself, with a success of which, by the favour of God, I have certainly no reason to repent. At this time also, both he and I refuted the calumnies which Castellio had caused to be anonymously circulated against the eternal predestination of God.

But the thing which grieved him most of all was the very cruel persecution of the godly at Paris, by breaking in upon their meeting in St James's Street, where they had assembled to celebrate the Lord's Supper. About eighty of their number were taken, (the rest having escaped by the darkness of the night,) and were dragged to the prisons at daybreak, amid reproach and insult, although several ladies of the highest rank were among them. The rage of the king had been inflamed, not only by those who surrounded him, but also by the circumstances of the times; for this occurrence took place just after the news had arrived of the great defeat at St Quintin. The godly having assembled at night, because it was not in their power to do

Digitized by Google

so by day, those old and stale calumnies devised against the Christians, in ancient times, were again revived by one Democharès, a Doctor of Sorbonne, who, forsooth, insinuated that all these calamities were truly to be ascribed to the Christians alone. Witnesses were even suborned to prove the putting out of lights and prostitution; this persons were found credulous enough to believe. Seven martyrs were therefore led forth to the flames, and this was thrice repeated; the list including a certain lady of rank, whose fortitude, as well as that of the other six, and among them two very young men, was truly admirable.

But the calumny of the Sorbonnists was exposed, though by no means suppressed, by a matron who voluntarily came forward to court investigation for her imprisoned daughters, who were said to have been violated, and also by the very excellent and learned individual who had officiated there as pastor for some months before, and who, in an admirable little book, completely refuted all those lies. Calvin also procured an embassy to be sent with the utmost dispatch from the German princes. By these means the storm was somewhat calmed. The year which followed, (1558,) was a happy one for the Republic of Geneva, a perpetual confederation having been entered into between the Bernese and the Genevese, to the great disappointment of those who had been banished. A variety of circumstances attended this successful result, among others a last fruitless attempt of the banished. But on this I have determined not to enlarge. Abroad persecution was again renewed in France, and at home the abominable heresy of the Tritheists arose, as from the ashes of Servetus, under the auspices of one Valentine Gentilis, a native of Cosenza. To obviate these evils, deputies were sent to the

Digitized by Google

princes of Germany, with a letter from Calvin, explaining the many calamities of the churches, and requesting their interposition, and he himself, meanwhile, wrote numerous letters to confirm the sufferers. The course which was taken in the case of Gentilis, and the end of that monster, I will relate briefly; because a full account of the whole matter, partly drawn up by Calvin himself from the public proceedings, and partly written with fidelity by Benedict Aretius, a minister of Berne, with an appendix, containing a refutation of his blasphemy, together with all and every thing pertaining to the subject, was published in this city in the year 1567.

This unhappy man, then, who was endowed with a shrewd but also with a crafty and sophistical turn of mind, a considerable time after punishment had been inflicted on Servetus, having fallen in with his treatise, as well as Calvin's refutation, easily perceived that neither the phantoms nor ideas with which he had coloured the heresy of the Samosatene, nor the confounding of the persons with the essence as introduced by Sabellius, nor, in fine, the Divinity of Christ, as it was held by the impure Arius, could be reconciled with the Word of God. On the other hand, he saw that what was delivered in Scripture concerning the one essence of God, and the three hypostases, with distinct differences from each other, could not be made to accord with human reason. He therefore did what minds of his description are wont to do, that is, instead of submitting to the wisdom of God, he persuaded himself that nothing was true that did not accord with human reason. Therefore, assigning supremacy to the person of the Father only, whom he maintained to be alone the sole and only self-existing God, he began openly to profess what he called *Essentiation*, that is, a propagation of essences, three in number, both as persons

Digitized by Google

and as essences, that is, in other words, three Gods, three eternal, omnipotent, and infinite Beings. In this way he impudently placed himself in opposition, not only to the holy Word of God, but also to the Council of Nice, (repudiating the Athanasian Creed,) and the authority of the most ancient writers, also such as Ignatius, Tertullian, and Lactantius. For he not only rejected all orthodox writers who followed the Council of Nice, but even charged them with impiety. This blasphemy was followed by others concerning the hypostatic union. These articles he brought forward secretly at first to a few individuals, the principal being John Paul Alciat, a military man from Milan, and George Blandrata of Salusses, a physician by profession. Having at last submitted his views to the Italian Presbytery, an extraordinary meeting was held, where, being patiently heard in presence of certain select senators, and of all the ministers and presbyters, and refuted by Calvin out of the Word of God, as to everything which he thought proper to adduce, the result was, that the Italians immediately subscribed the orthodox faith, with only six exceptions, and even these afterwards, on being taken aside, subscribed with their hand indeed, but, as it afterwards appeared, not with the heart also. Gentilis then returning to his old course, is detected circulating his former blasphemy, and when apprehended makes no attempt at concealment, but is heard as long and as much as he chose. At length, as if vanquished, (for he had nothing but obstinacy to oppose to Calvin,) he pretends to be exceedingly penitent, and, indeed, a copy of his recantation, in his own handwriting, is still extant. In short, having gone through the streets abjuring his heresy, he is dismissed, after binding himself by oath not to go beyond the gates of the city. Shortly, however, breaking faith, he runs off to Savoy to

Digitized by Google

Matthew Gribald, and is followed some time after by Alciat and Blandrata, the future devastators of Transylvania and the neighbouring countries. But Gentilis (the judgment of God even then impending over him) continued to reside with Gribald—for they both despised the other two as ignorant and unlearned men—and began to print a small work against Athanasius and Calvin. He proceeded afterwards to Lyons, where he got the printing finished, prefixing a dedication to the Prefect of Gez, who was altogether unaware of his wickedness. Being afterwards apprehended at Lyons by the Papists, (I know not why,) he told them that he was writing against Calvin, and was set at liberty as one who deserved well of the Catholic Church. After this he went into Moravia to Blandrata and Alciat, and others of the same stamp. Afterwards, when they could not come to an agreement among themselves, (most of them having gone over from Tritheism to the doctrine of Paul of Samosata,) as if the hand of Christ himself were leading him to punishment, he returns to Savoy to his friend Gribald. But that plague another plague had already carried off. Calvin, too, had by this time been taken from us. Then, as if he had been altogether infatuated, or because he trusted that since Calvin's death there was nobody remaining by whom he could be convicted, he goes directly to the Prefect of Gez, who was deservedly offended with him, and being immediately recognised, and, by the just judgment of God for his former tergiversation, sent to Berne to plead his cause, was there convicted of perjury and manifest dishonesty. After many fruitless attempts to bring him back to the right way he was put to death, and so paid the punishment due to his many crimes. Such, then, was the termination of this cause. And yet there are not wanting some excellent defenders of Christianity, forsooth, both among

Digitized by Google

the Catholics and among those worthies the Ubiquitarians, who dare to accuse Calvin as the author of these blasphemies, nay, to calumniate him as one who opened up the way to Atheism and Mahommedanism; though the truth is, that while they were fast asleep, Calvin was the first and almost the only one in our time by whom those very blasphemies were most laboriously confuted. But at Paris the Cardinal, by whose nod the King administered all affairs, attempted to withdraw the cognizance of heresy from the ordinary judges (those whom they call laics) to a triumvirate of cardinals. The Parliament of Paris, opposing by divine rather than human suggestion, inasmuch as they were pleading their own cause and not the cause of Christ, he abandoned his nefarious attempt.

But the end of this year was to us the commencement of a greater sorrow; Calvin being seized, in the month of October, with a quartan fever, a disease which we have at length learned, by too sad experience, is justly regarded by medical men as fatal to those who are advanced in years. For although that disease in Calvin's case continued only eight months, yet it so exhausted his spare body, worn out by labours and exertions, that he never entirely recovered it. Meanwhile the physicians strongly advising, and we also beseeching him to have some regard for his health, he, by necessity, desisted from preaching and lecturing, but continued spending days and nights in dictating and writing letters. He had no expression more frequently in his mouth than that life, as he expressed it, would be bitter to him if spent in indolence, though, indeed, we who were strong might, in comparison with him, have been thought indolent. Of this we have a testimony in the last edition of his Christian Institutes, both in Latin and French, and his Commentaries on Isaiah, not so much an amended edi-

Digitized by Google

tion of those which Galars took down from his Lectures, as an entirely new work.

The following year, viz., 1559, was remarkable for the peace and very close affinity contracted between the two most powerful kings, and would, perhaps, have been the last year of the Genevese Republic, had not the counsels of the Papists, who were abusing the simplicity of King Henry, been providentially frustrated. For it is certain that Henry, after issuing the most severe edicts, and throwing some of the senators into prison, merely for giving it as their opinion that in the meanwhile, until a general council was called, more leniency should be shown in matters of religion, had it especially in view to restore the Duke of Savoy, and completely overthrow Geneva. Calvin, on the contrary, though in bad health, laboured at Geneva to defeat his designs. He confirmed the Churches and all the brethren, who, on account of the prospect before them, were in the greatest distress, and was incessant in prayer imploring assistance from the Lord. In the midst of the terror which prevailed both at home and abroad, the monarch, while in the very act of preparing for the celebration of the marriage by which he was to confirm the peace, received a fatal wound in a mock combat, and that from the hand of the very man to whom, as commander of the Royal Guards, he had formerly assigned the office of apprehending those senators. This death Cardinal Lorraine wished it to be thought he had afterwards expiated by the most iniquitous murder of Annas de Bourge, a most learned lawyer, a most upright senator, and, in fine, a most holy martyr of Christ.

But Geneva, by the singular providence of God, as if the Lord were again and again causing the purest light to arise out of the thickest darkness, felt so confident in

Digitized by Google

these times, (the thing is scarcely credible,) that in the very year, and almost at the very instant, when these powerful princes were conspiring her destruction, it gave orders, on the suggestion of Calvin, for the erection of a magnificent building for a school, provided with eight teachers of youth, and public professors of Hebrew, Greek, Philosophy, and Theology. The dedication to Almighty God took place in due form in a full assembly of the people in the principal church, wherein, for the first time, were read and established those laws which related to the appropriation and perpetual maintenance of this most useful and sacred institution.

In the following year (1560) much obloquy was thrown upon Calvin by some, who charged him with instigating certain persons against Francis II., the heir to his father's dominions; the persons meant being those from whose fate the tumult has received the name of Amboise. I know for certain that Calvin had no part or portion in this matter, and even openly disapproved it, both by word, and by letters written to his friends. This same year, one Stancarus of Mantua (Italy seeming fatal to the Poles) began to assert that Christ is not a Mediator, except according to the flesh, bringing a charge of Arianism against all who held that he was a Mediator as God. The ground of the charge was, that they, in this way, made the Son inferior to the Father. This calumny, and the whole heresy, was solidly refuted, among others by Melancthon and Martyr. Calvin also, at the request of the Poles, confuted it very briefly, but with great force; and at the same time foreseeing what shortly happened, viz., that some unskilful persons, in their zeal to refute Stancarus, would, if they did not take care, fall into the error of the Tritheists, he distinctly forewarned them of the danger, and exhorted them, while standing on

Digitized by Google

their guard against Blandrata and his followers, and asserting that Christ was Mediator in both natures, not to multiply the Godhead. In so far, however, as regarded those who were to perish, this exhortation was given in vain.

At this time also, the Bohemian Waldenses having sent two of their brethren to Calvin, and put some questions to him concerning religion, he, of course, kindly answered them, and also advised them to enter into full connection with other churches. At the same time, not a few Frenchmen having taken refuge in England, after the death of Queen Mary, trusting to the singular piety and humanity of her Most Serene Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, and several of the clergy having, with the consent of Edmund Grindall, Bishop of London, requested that some one should be sent to constitute a French church there, it was agreed to send Galars.

In the end of the year 1560, Francis the Second having suddenly died, at the very time when all things seemed so utterly desperate that God alone could give a remedy, Charles the Ninth had no sooner succeeded to the crown than a messenger arrived from him with a letter, in which he complained that persons were sent from Geneva to disturb his kingdom of France, and demanded that they should be forthwith recalled; or that, otherwise, he would not overlook the very just cause he had to avenge the injury. Calvin being called upon by the Senate, replied in his own name and that of his colleagues, that on the petition of the French churches they had given their advice to certain men of known faith and integrity, whom they thought fit for the purpose, not to be wanting to their country, when imploring their assistance in a cause so holy as that of training up a pure church; that this advice had been acted upon, not in order to disturb the kingdom, but to teach the gospel of peace; and that, moreover, if they were accused of having

Digitized by Google

done any thing of the kind, they were prepared to answer their accusers, in presence of the king himself. The matter went no farther. The same year, Calvin and myself answered the book of that most troublesome man, Tilemann Heshusius. Calvin next refuted the blasphemies which Valentine Gentilis had printed at Lyons, against the Athanasian Creed. He also published his Prælections on Daniel, dedicating them to the churches of France. In these he was, indeed, an interpreter of the prophet; but he also, in the dedication, became himself a prophet, predicting impending storms at the very time when the meeting of the bishops was held at Poissy, and when, at a very full Convention of the Estates of the Kingdom, an approved Confession of the Gallic churches was by me submitted to the king. At this time most people were flattering themselves that an immediate blow was to be given to the Papacy. At this period also, one Francis Baldwin, afterwards surnamed Ecebolius, (changeling,) on account of his having changed his religion at least three or four times, (for, even before the last calamity, which befel the French churches on the 24th of August 1572, we have the testimony of most excellent and venerable men, nay, even Baldwin's own letter to that effect, exhibited to the Synod, that he was exceedingly desirous to be one day connected with us;) this man, I say, being suborned by a cardinal, and by wicked arts reconciled to the Navarrene, circulated at court a short treatise, either published by himself or by one Cassander, who (by his own account) was a pious and moderate man; a book worse even than the Interim of Charles the Fifth, in this respect, that under the semblance of a moderate reform, it defended all the corruptions of the Papacy. Calvin having been made aware of this matter by me, published a refutation, to which additions were shortly after made, sufficient to make all aware of the temper and the in-

Digitized by Google

tentions of Baldwin. Neither this, however, nor any other reply, could suppress his ravings; nor did he from that time desist from assailing Calvin with his vile invectives, until at the end of the year, hated by God, and by men of both religions, whom he had so often deceived, while prosecuting some lawsuit or other at Paris, or pining with envy, because he saw another preferred to him to accompany Henry III., when setting out to visit the kingdom of Poland, he ceased at the same time to slander and to live.

But in the year 1562, after not only peace but also liberty had been granted to the French churches on certain conditions, by a formal edict of the king, the Navarrene being forthwith seduced by the wiles of the Papists, and the Duke of Guise, after committing the savage slaughter at Vassy, having sounded the trumpet and commenced that civil war, which has now been raging for twelve successive years in miserable France, it is impossible to describe the many heavy cares which weighed upon Calvin; his infirmities also increasing so much, that it might then have been seen he was advancing with rapid step to a better life. He, however, ceased not to comfort and exhort, nay, also to preach and deliver his lectures on Theology. He, moreover, drew up that most admirable Confession of Faith which was presented to the States of the Empire at Frankfort, in the name of the Prince of Condé and all the pious, who, in addition to the injury of being most unjustly involved in war, had been also most undeservedly traduced to the Germans, as holding certain false doctrines.

It will not be disagreeable to the reader here to mention a circumstance not unworthy of observation. On the 19th of December, which happened to be a Sabbath, Calvin was confined to bed with the gout. The north wind having continued to blow, with the greatest violence, for two successive days, Calvin, in the hearing of several persons, says, "I

Digitized by Google

know not what the cause of it is, but during the night I thought I heard martial music sounding aloud, and could not persuade myself that it was not really so. Let us pray, I beseech you; for some matter of great moment is going forward." It turned out that on that very day a fierce battle was fought at Dreux, though the news of it did not arrive for some days after. In the following year, (1563,) Calvin's diseases had so much increased, and were so numerous, as to make it almost impossible to believe that so strong and noble a mind could be any longer confined in a body so fragile, so exhausted by labour, and, in fine, so broken down by suffering. But even then he could not be persuaded to spare himself. Nay, if at any time he abstained from public duty, (and he never did so without the greatest reluctance,) he still at home gave answers to those who consulted him, or wore out his amanuenses by dictating to them, though unfatigued himself. In testimony of this, we have his two very serious Admonitions to the Poles against the blasphemers of the Holy Trinity; also the answers which he gave, both by word and writing, to those brethren who were sent to him from the Synod of Lyons; the Commentary on the Four Books of Moses, which he wrote in Latin, and which he afterwards himself translated into French; and, finally, his Commentary on the Book of Joshua, which was the last of his labours. He began it at this time, and brought it to a close just before his death.

The year 1564 was to him the commencement of perpetual felicity, and to us of the greatest and best founded grief. On the 6th of February, the asthma impeding his utterance, he delivered his last sermon; and from that time, with the exception of his being sometimes carried to the meeting of the congregation, where he delivered a few sentences, (the last occasion was on the last day of March,) he

Digitized by Google

entirely desisted from his office of preaching. His diseases, the effect of incredible exertions of body and mind, were various and complicated, as he himself states in a letter which he addressed to the physicians of Montpelier. Besides being naturally of a feeble and spare body, inclining to consumption, he slept almost waking, and spent a great part of the year in preaching, lecturing, and dictating. For at least ten years he never dined, taking no food at all till supper; so that it is wonderful he could have so long escaped consumption. Being subject to *hemicrania*, for which starvation was the only cure, he, in consequence, sometimes abstained from food for thirty-six hours in succession. Partly also from overstraining his voice, and partly from the immoderate use of aloes, a circumstance not attended to till it was too late, he became afflicted with ulcerated hæmorrhoids, and occasionally, for about five years before his death, discharged considerable quantities of blood. When the quartan fever left him, his right limb was seized with gout; every now and then he had attacks of colic; and, last of all, he was afflicted with the stone, though he had never been aware of its existence till a few months before his death. The physicians used what remedies they could; and there was no man who attended more carefully to the prescriptions of his physicians, except that in regard to mental exertions he was most careless of his health, not even his headaches preventing him from taking his turn in preaching. While oppressed with so many diseases, no man ever heard him utter a word unbecoming a man of firmness, far less unbecoming a Christian. Only raising his eyes towards heaven, he would say, "O Lord, how long;" for even when he was in health this was an expression which he often used in reference to the calamities of his brethren, which night and day affected him much more than his own

Digitized by Google

sufferings. We advising and entreating him that while sick he should desist from all fatigue of dictating, or at least of writing,—"What," he would say, "would you have the Lord to find me idle?"

On the 10th of March, having gone to him in a body, as we were wont to do, we found him dressed, and sitting at his little table, where he usually wrote or meditated. On seeing us, after he had remained silent for some time, with his forehead leaning on one hand, as was his custom in studying, he at length, with a voice now and then interrupted, but with a bland and smiling countenance, says, "My dearest brethren, I feel much obliged to you for your great anxiety on my account, and hope that in fifteen days (it was the stated day for censure of manners) I will be present for the last time at your meeting; for I think that by that time the Lord will manifest what he has determined to do with me, and that the result will be that he is to take me to himself."

Accordingly, on the 24th of same month, he was present at the censures, as he had been wont to be; and these having been quietly performed, he said that he felt that the Lord had given him a short respite, and taking a French New Testament into his hands, he read some passages from the notes which are appended to it, and asked the opinion of the brethren respecting them, because he had undertaken to get them corrected. The next day he felt worse, as if fatigued by the previous day's labour; but on the 27th, being conveyed to the door of the senate-house, he went up, leaning on two attendants, into the hall, and there having introduced a new rector of the school, uncovered his head, and returned thanks for the kindness he had received, and especially for the attention which the Senate had shown him during this his

Digitized by Google

last illness; "for I feel," says he, "that I am now in this place for the last time." Having thus spoken, with faltering voice, he took his leave, amidst sobs and tears. On the 2d day of April, which was Easter day, although much exhausted, he was carried to the church in a chair, and was present during the whole service. He received the Lord's Supper from my hand, and sung the hymn along with the others, though with tremulous voice, yet with a look in which joy was not obscurely indicated on his dying countenance.

On the 25th of April, he made his will in the following terms:—

THE TESTAMENT OF JOHN CALVIN.

"In the name of God, Amen. On the 25th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1564, I, Peter Chenalat, citizen and notary of Geneva, witness and declare that I was called upon by that admirable man, John Calvin, minister of the Word of God in this church at Geneva, and a citizen of the same State, who, being sick in body, but of sound mind, told me that it was his intention to execute his testament, and explain the nature of his last will, and begged me to receive it, and to write it down as he should rehearse and dictate it with his tongue. This I declare that I immediately did, writing down word for word as he was pleased to dictate and rehearse; and that I have in no respect added to or subtracted from his words, but have followed the form dictated by himself.

"In the name of the Lord, Amen. I, John Calvin, minister of the Word of God in this church of Geneva, being afflicted and oppressed with various diseases, which easily induce me to believe that the Lord God has determined

Digitized by Google

shortly to call me away out of this world, have resolved to make my testament, and commit my last will to writing in the manner following:—First of all, I give thanks to God, that taking mercy on me, whom he had created and placed in this world, he not only delivered me out of the deep darkness of idolatry in which I was plunged, that he might bring me into the light of his Gospel, and make me a partaker in the doctrine of salvation, of which I was most unworthy; and not only, with the same mercy and benignity, kindly and graciously bore with my faults and my sins, for which, however, I deserved to be rejected by him and exterminated, but also vouchsafed me such clemency and kindness that he has deigned to use my assistance in preaching and promulgating the truth of his Gospel. And I testify and declare, that it is my intention to spend what yet remains of my life in the same faith and religion which he has delivered to me by his Gospel; and that I have no other defence or refuge for salvation than his gratuitous adoption, on which alone my salvation depends. With my whole soul I embrace the mercy which he has exercised towards me through Jesus Christ, atoning for my sins with the merits of his death and passion, that in this way he might satisfy for all my crimes and faults, and blot them from his remembrance. I testify also and declare, that I suppliantly beg of Him that he may be pleased so to wash and purify me in the blood which my Sovereign Redeemer has shed for the sins of the human race, that under his shadow I may be able to stand at the judgment-seat. I likewise declare, that, according to the measure of grace and goodness which the Lord hath employed towards me, I have endeavoured, both in my sermons and also in my writings and commentaries, to preach His Word purely and chastely, and faithfully to interpret His sacred Scriptures.

Digitized by Google

I also testify and declare, that, in all the contentions and disputations in which I have been engaged with the enemies of the Gospel, I have used no impostures, no wicked and sophistical devices, but have acted candidly and sincerely in defending the truth. But, woe is me! my ardour and zeal (if indeed worthy of the name) have been so careless and languid, that I confess I have failed innumerable times to execute my office properly, and had not He, of His boundless goodness, assisted me, all that zeal had been fleeting and vain. Nay, I even acknowledge, that if the same goodness had not assisted me, those mental endowments which the Lord bestowed upon me would, at his judgment-seat, prove me more and more guilty of sin and sloth. For all these reasons, I testify and declare that I trust to no other security for my salvation than this, and this only, viz., that as God is the Father of mercy, he will show himself such a Father to me, who acknowledge myself to be a miserable sinner. As to what remains, I wish that, after my departure out of this life, my body be committed to the earth, (after the form and manner which is used in this church and city,) till the day of a happy resurrection arrive. As to the slender patrimony which God has bestowed upon me, and of which I have determined to dispose in this will and testament, I appoint Anthony Calvin, my very dear brother, my heir, but in the way of honour only, giving to him for his own the silver cup which I received as a present from Varanius, and with which I desire he will be contented. Every thing else belonging to my succession I give him in trust, begging he will at his death leave it to his children. To the Boys' School I bequeath out of my succession ten gold pieces; as many to poor strangers; and as many to Joanna, the daughter of Charles Constans, and myself by affinity. To Samuel and John, the sons of my brother, I be-

Digitized by Google

queath, to be paid by him at his death, each 400 gold pieces; and to Anna, and Susanna, and Dorothy, his daughters, each 300 gold pieces; to David, their brother, in reprehension of his juvenile levity and petulance, I leave only 25 gold pieces. This is the amount of the whole patrimony and goods which the Lord has bestowed on me, as far as I can estimate, setting a value both on my library and moveables, and all my domestic utensils, and, generally, my whole means and effects; but should they produce a larger sum, I wish the surplus to be divided proportionally among all the sons and daughters of my brother, not excluding David, if, through the goodness of God, he shall have returned to good behaviour. But should the whole exceed the above mentioned sum, I believe it will be no great matter, especially after my debts are paid, the doing of which I have carefully committed to my said brother, having confidence in his faith and good-will; for which reason I will and appoint him executor of this my testament, and along with him my distinguished friend, Lawrence Normand, giving power to them to make out an inventory of my effects, without being obliged to comply with the strict forms of law. I empower them also to sell my moveables, that they may turn them into money, and execute my will above written, and explained and dictated by me, John Calvin, on this 25th day of April, in the year 1564."

"After I, the foresaid notary, had written the above testament, the aforesaid John Calvin immediately confirmed it with his usual subscription and handwriting. On the following day, which was the 26th day of April of same year, the same distinguished man, Calvin, ordered me to be sent for, and along with me, Theodore Beza, Raymund Chauvet, Michael Cop, Lewis Enoch, Nicholas Colladon, and James Bordese, ministers and preachers of the Word of God in

Digitized by Google

this church of Geneva, and likewise the distinguished Henry Scrimger, Professor of Arts, all citizens of Geneva, and in presence of them all, testified and declared that he had dictated to me this his testament in the form above written; and, at the same time, he ordered me to read it in their hearing, as having been called for that purpose. This I declare I did articulately, and with clear voice. And after it was so read, he testified and declared that it was his last will, which he desired to be ratified. In testimony and confirmation whereof, he requested them all to subscribe said testament with their own hands. This was immediately done by them, month and year above written, at Geneva, in the street commonly called Canon Street, and at the dwelling-place of said testator. In faith and testimony of which I have written the foresaid testament, and subscribed it with my own hand, and sealed it with the common seal of our supreme magistracy.

"PETER CHENALAT."

This testament being executed, he sent an intimation to the four syndics, and all the senators, that, before his departure out of life, he was desirous once more to address them all in the senate-house, to which he hoped he might be carried on the following day. The senators replied, that they would rather come to him, and begged that he would consider the state of his health. On the following day, when the whole senate had come to him in a body, after mutual salutations, and he had begged pardon for their having come to him, when he ought rather to have gone to them; first premising that he had long desired this interview with them, but had put it off until he should have a surer presentiment of his decease, he proceeded thus:—

Digitized by Google

"Honoured Lords,—I thank you exceedingly for having conferred so many honours on one who plainly deserved nothing of the kind, and for having so often borne patiently with my very numerous infirmities. This I have always regarded as the strongest proof of your singular good-will toward me. And though in the discharge of my duty I have had various battles to fight, and various insults to endure, because to these every man, even the most excellent, must be subjected, I know and acknowledge, that none of these things happened through your fault; and I earnestly entreat you, that if, in anything, I have not done as I ought, you will attribute it to the want of ability rather than of will; for I can truly declare that I have sincerely studied the interest of your republic. Though I have not discharged my duty fully, I have always, to the best of my ability, consulted for the public good; and did I not acknowledge that the Lord, on his part, hath sometimes made my labours profitable, I should lay myself open to a charge of dissimulation. But this I beg of you, again and again, that you will be pleased to excuse me for having performed so little in public and in private, compared with what I ought to have done. I also certainly acknowledge, that on another account also I am highly indebted to you, viz., your having borne patiently with my vehemence, which was sometimes carried to excess; my sins, in this respect, I trust, have been pardoned by God also. But in regard to the doctrine which I have delivered in your hearing, I declare that the Word of God, entrusted to me, I have taught, not rashly or uncertainly, but purely and sincerely; as well knowing that His wrath was otherwise impending on my head, as I am certain that my labours in teaching were not displeasing to Him. And this I testify the more willingly before God, and before you all, because I have no

Digitized by Google

doubt whatever that Satan, according to his wont, will stir up wicked, fickle, and giddy men, to corrupt the pure doctrine which you have heard of me."

Then referring to the great blessings with which the Lord had favoured them, "I," says he, "am the best witness from how many and how great dangers the hand of Almighty God hath delivered you. You see, moreover, what your present situation is. Therefore, whether in prosperity or adversity, have this, I pray you, always present before your eyes, that it is He alone who establishes kings and states, and on that account wishes men to worship him. Remember how David declared, that he had fallen when he was in the enjoyment of profound peace, and assuredly would never have risen again, had not God, in his singular goodness, stretched out his hand to help him. What then will be the case with such diminutive mortals as we are, if it was so with him who was so strong and powerful? You have need of great humbleness of mind, that you may walk carefully, setting God always before you, and leaning only on his protection; assured, as you have often already experienced, that, by his assistance, you will stand strong, although your safety and security hang, as it were, by a slender thread. Therefore, if prosperity is given you, beware, I pray you, of being puffed up as the wicked are, and rather humbly give thanks to God. But if adversity befalls you, and death surrounds you on every side, still hope in Him who even raises the dead. Nay, consider that you are then especially tried by God, that you may learn more and more to have respect to Him only. But if you are desirous that this republic may be preserved in its strength, be particularly on your guard against allowing the sacred throne on which he hath placed you to be polluted. For He alone is the supreme God, the King

Digitized by Google

of kings, and Lord of lords, who will give honour to those by whom He is honoured, but will cast down the despisers. Worship Him, therefore, according to his precepts; and study this more and more, for we are always very far from doing what it is our duty to do. I know the disposition and character of each of you, and I know that you need exhortation. Even among those who excel, there is not one who is not deficient in many things. Let every one examine himself, and wherein he sees himself to be defective, let him ask of the Lord. We see how much iniquity prevails in the counsels of this world. Some are cold; others, negligent of the public good, give their whole attention to their own affairs; others indulge their own private affections; others use not the excellent gifts of God as is meet; others ostentatiously display themselves, and, from overweening confidence, insist that all their opinions shall be approved of by others. I admonish the old not to envy their younger brethren, whom they may see adorned, by God's goodness, with some superior gifts. The younger, again, I admonish to conduct themselves with modesty, keeping far aloof from all haughtiness of mind. Let no one give disturbance to his neighbour, but let every one shun deceit, and all that bitterness of feeling which, in the administration of the Republic, has led many away from the right path. These things you will avoid, if each keeps within his own sphere, and all conduct themselves with good faith in the department which has been entrusted to them. In the decision of civil causes let there be no place for partiality or hatred; let no one pervert justice by oblique artifices; let no one, by his recommendations, prevent the laws from having full effect; let no one depart from what is just and good. Should any one feel tempted by some sinister affection, let him firmly resist it, having respect to Him from whom he

Digitized by Google

received his station, and supplicating the assistance of his Holy Spirit. Finally, I again entreat you to pardon my infirmities, which I acknowledge and confess before God and his angels, and also before you, my much respected Lords." Having thus spoken, and prayed to Almighty God, that he would crown them more and more with his gifts, and guide them by his Holy Spirit, for the safety of the whole Republic, giving his right hand to each, he left them in sorrow and in tears, all feeling as if they were taking a last farewell of their common parent.

On the 28th of April, when all of us in the ministry of Geneva had gone to him at his request, he says, " Brethren, after I am dead, persist in this work, and be not dispirited; for the Lord will save this Republic and Church from the threats of the enemy. Let dissension be far away from you, and embrace each other with mutual love. Think again and again what you owe to this Church in which the Lord hath placed you, and let nothing induce you to quit it. It will, indeed, be easy for some who are weary of it to slink away, but they will find, to their experience, that the Lord cannot be deceived. When I first came to this city, the gospel was, indeed, preached, but matters were in the greatest confusion, as if Christianity had consisted in nothing else than the throwing down of images; and there were not a few wicked men from whom I suffered the greatest indignities; but the Lord our God so confirmed me, who am by no means naturally bold, (I say what is true,) that I succumbed to none of their attempts. I afterwards returned thither from Strasburg in obedience to my calling, but with an unwilling mind, because I thought I should prove unfruitful. For not knowing what the Lord had determined, I saw nothing before me but numbers of the greatest difficulties. But proceeding in this work, I at

Digitized by Google

length perceived that the Lord had truly blessed my labours. Do you also persist in this vocation, and maintain the established order; at the same time, make it your endeavour to keep the people in obedience to the doctrine; for there are some wicked and contumacious persons. Matters, as you see, are tolerably settled. The more guilty, therefore, will you be before God, if they go to wreck through your indolence. But I declare, brethren, that I have lived with you in the closest bonds of true and sincere affection, and now, in like manner, part from you. But if, while under this disease, you have experienced any degree of peevishness from me, I beg your pardon, and heartily thank you, that when I was sick, you have borne the burden imposed upon you." When he had thus spoken, he shook hands with each of us. We, with most sorrowful hearts, and certainly not unmoistened eyes, departed from him.

On the 11th of May, having learned by a letter from Farel (Viret was farther distant) that the old man, now in his eightieth year, and in feeble health, had determined on making the journey to see him, he thus wrote him in Latin:—"Farewell, my best and most right-hearted brother; and since God is pleased that you should survive me in this world, live mindful of our friendship, of which, as it was useful to the Church of God, the fruit still awaits us in heaven. I would not have you fatigue yourself on my account. I draw my breath with difficulty, and am daily waiting till I altogether cease to breathe. It is enough that to Christ I live and die; to his people he is gain in life and in death. Farewell again, not forgetting the brethren. At Geneva, 11th May 1564." The good old man, however, came to Geneva, and after seeing and conversing with him, returned next day to Neufchatel.

The interval to his death he spent in almost constant

Digitized by Google

prayer. His utterance, indeed, was much impeded, but his eyes, which to the very last were clear and sparkling, he raised towards heaven with an expression of countenance on which the ardour of the suppliant was fully displayed. In his sufferings he often groaned like David, "I was silent, O Lord, because thou didst it;" and sometimes in the words from Isaiah, "I did mourn like a dove." I have also heard him say, "Thou, O Lord, bruisest me; but it is enough for me that it is thy hand." His door must have remained open night and day, had all who wished to show their duty to him been admitted. When he saw that owing to his impeded utterance, which we have mentioned, he could not address them, he asked each one rather to pray for him than take any trouble about visiting him. He also often hinted to me, though I was aware that my presence was never disagreeable to him, that I ought not to allow my regard for him to interfere in the least with my avocations, so sparing was he of the time which required to be devoted to the Church, and so exceedingly careful not to be at all burdensome to his friends.

In this way, resigned in himself, and consoling his friends, he lived till the 19th of May, on which day we ministers were wont to have our privy censures, and to dine together as a mark of our friendship; Pentecost and the dispensation of the Lord's Supper being to follow two days after. On that day, therefore, when he had allowed us to have a common supper prepared beside himself, and having, as it were, collected his strength, had been conveyed from his bed to the adjoining room, he says, "I come to you, brethren, for the last time. I am never again to sit at table." This was a very sad commencement to our supper. He, however, offered up a prayer, and took a little food, conversing cheerfully as might be when we

Digitized by Google

were at table. Before supper was completely finished, he called to be removed into the adjoining chamber, and addressing us with a smiling countenance, says, "The intervening wall, though it make me absent in body, will not prevent me from being present with you in spirit."

The event was as he had predicted. From that day he never rose from his bed. There was very little change on his countenance, but his whole body was so emaciated that nothing seemed left but the spirit. On the day of his departure, viz., the 27th of May, he seemed to be stronger, and to speak with less difficulty. But it was nature's last effort, for in the evening, about eight o'clock, symptoms of approaching death suddenly appeared. I had just left him a little before, and on receiving intimation from the servants, immediately hastened to him with one of the brethren. We found he had already died, and so very calmly, without any convulsion of his feet or hands, that he did not even fetch a deeper sigh. He had remained perfectly sensible, and was not entirely deprived of utterance to his very last breath. Indeed, he looked much more like one sleeping than dead. On that day, then, at the same time with the setting sun, this splendid luminary was withdrawn from us.

That night and the following day there was a general lamentation throughout the city—the whole State regretting its wisest citizen—the Church deploring the departure of its faithful pastor—the academy grieving at being deprived of so great a teacher, and all lamenting the loss of one who was, under God, a common parent and comforter. Many citizens were eager to see the body, and could scarcely be torn away from it. Some foreigners also, who had come from a distance to see and hear him, among them the illustrious ambassador of the Queen of England to the court of France, were anxious to have a

Digitized by Google

look of his corpse. At first admission was given; but as the curiosity became excessive, and might have given occasion to calumny, it was thought advisable, on the following day, which was the Lord's Day, to wrap the body in linen, in the usual manner, and inclose it in its coffin. Two days after, the funeral took place, attended by the senators, pastors, and professors, and almost the whole city, many shedding tears. He was buried in the common cemetery of Plein Palais, with no extraordinary pomp, and, as he had commanded, without any grave-stone. This suggested to me the following stanzas:—

Romæ ruentis terror ille maximus,
Quem mortuum lugent boni, horrescunt mali.
Ipsa à quo potuit virtutem discere virtus,
Cur adeo exiguo ignotoque in cespite clausus
Calvinus lateat, rogas?
Calvinum assidue comitata modestia vivum
Hoc tumulo manibus condidit ipsa suis.
O te beatum cespitem tanto hospite!
O cui invidere cuncta possint marmora!

He lived 54 years, 10 months, 17 days, the half of which he spent in the ministry. He was of moderate stature, of a pale and dark complexion, with eyes that sparkled to the moment of his death, and bespoke his great intellect. In dress he was neither over careful nor mean, but such as became his singular modesty. In diet he was temperate, being equally averse to sordidness and luxury. He was most sparing in the quantities of his food, and for many years took only one meal a-day, on account of the weakness of his stomach. He took little sleep, and had such an astonishing memory, that any person whom he had once seen he instantly recognised at the distance of years, and when, in the course of dictating, he happened to be interrupted for

Digitized by Google

several hours, as often happened, as soon as he returned he commenced at once to dictate where he had left off. Whatever he required to know for the performance of his duty, though involved in a multiplicity of other affairs, he never forgot. On whatever subject he was consulted, his judgment was so clear and correct, that he often seemed almost to prophesy; nor do I recollect of any person having been led into error in consequence of following his advice. He despised mere eloquence, and was sparing in the use of words, but he was by no means a careless writer. No theologian of this period (I do not speak invidiously) wrote more purely, weightily, and judiciously, though he wrote more than any individual either in our recollection or that of our fathers. For, by the hard studies of his youth, and a certain acuteness of judgment, confirmed by practice in dictating, he was never at a loss for an appropriate and weighty expression, and wrote very much as he spoke. In the doctrine which he delivered at the first, he persisted steadily to the last, scarcely making any change. Of few theologians within our recollection can the same thing be affirmed. With regard to his manners, although nature had formed him for gravity, yet, in the common intercourse of life, there was no man who was more pleasant. In bearing with infirmities he was remarkably prudent; never either putting weak brethren to the blush, or terrifying them by unseasonable rebuke, yet never conniving at or flattering their faults. Of adulation, dissimulation, and dishonesty, especially where religion was concerned, he was as determined and severe an enemy as he was a lover of truth, simplicity, and candour. He was naturally of a keen temper, and this had been increased by the very laborious life which he had led. But the Spirit of the Lord had so taught him to command his anger, that no word was heard to proceed from him unbe-

Digitized by Google

coming a good man. Still less did he ever allow his passion to proceed to extremes. Nor was he easily moved, unless when religion was at stake, though he had to do with men of a petulant and obstinate temper.

That one endowed with so great and so many virtues should have had numerous enemies, both at home and abroad, will astonish no one who has read even the account which profane history gives of men who were distinguished by their love of virtue. Little ground is there for wondering that one who was both a most powerful defender of sound doctrine, and an example of purity of life, should have been bitterly assailed. The thing to be wondered at rather is, that a single man, as if he had been a kind of Christian Hercules, should have been able to subdue so many monsters, and this by that mightiest of all clubs, the Word of God. Wherefore, as many adversaries as Satan stirred up against him, (for his enemies were always those who had declared war against piety and honesty,) so many trophies did the Lord bestow upon his servant. Some of those enemies give out that Calvin was a heretic, as if this were not the very name under which Christ was condemned, and that, too, by priests. He was expelled from Geneva! True; but he was also recalled. What, I ask, happened to the Apostles, what to Athanasius, what to Chrysostom? Other charges are brought against him, but of what kind? He was ambitious, forsooth, nay, he even aspired to a new popedom—he who, above all things, preferred this mode of life, this republic, in fine, this Church, which I may with truth describe as the abode of poverty. But he was a hoarder of wealth!—he, whose whole effects, including the proceeds of his library which was well sold, scarcely amounted to 300 gold pieces Hence, when refuting this impudent calumny, he observed, not less shrewdly than truly, "If some will not be persuaded while

Digitized by Google

I am alive, my death, at all events, will show that I have not been a money-making man." The Senate can testify that though his stipend was very small, yet he firmly refused any increase. Others make it a charge against him, that his brother, Anthony Calvin, divorced his first wife for adultery. What would they say, if he had continued to keep the adulteress? But if such misconduct is to be turned against him, what will become of the family of Jacob, and David, and the Son of God himself, who declared, that one of his twelve was a devil? As to indulgence in delicacies and luxury, let his labours bear witness. But then some are not ashamed to say and to write, that he reigned at Geneva, both in church and state, so as to supplant the ordinary tribunals. Others also give out that he procured a living man, and, in presence of the whole people, called him up as if he had been bringing a dead body to life,—a lie just as vile as if they had said he was the Pope at Rome. And yet Claudius Sponse, that rhapsodist of Sorbonne, has dared to repeat it in his most slanderous book. For what would these people be ashamed to say? No refutation is required by those who knew this great man when he was alive, nor by posterity, who will judge him by his works.

Having been a spectator of his conduct for sixteen years, I have given a faithful account both of his life and of his death, and I can now declare, that in him all men may see a most beautiful example of the Christian character, an example which it is as easy to slander as it is difficult to imitate.

Digitized by Google

LETTER

BY

JAMES SADOLET, A ROMAN CARDINAL,

TO

THE SENATE AND PEOPLE OF GENEVA;

IN WHICH HE ENDEAVOURS TO BRING THEM BACK TO THE ALLEGIANCE OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

SADOLET'S LETTER

TO

THE SENATE AND PEOPLE OF GENEVA.

JAMES SADOLET, BISHOP OF THE HOLY ROMAN CHURCH AT CARPENTRAS, CARDINAL, PRESBYTER OF THE ORDER OF ST CALIXTUS, TO HIS DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN, THE MAGISTRATES, SENATE, AND CITIZENS OF GENEVA.

VERY DEAR BRETHREN IN CHRIST,—Peace to you and with us, that is, with the Catholic Church, the mother of all, both us and you, love and concord from God, the Father Almighty, and from his only Son Jesus Christ, our Lord, together with the Holy Spirit, perfect Unity in Trinity; to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

I presume, very dear brethren, it is known to some of you that I am now residing at Carpentras, having come from Nice, to which I had attended the Supreme Pontiff, on his journey from Rome, to mediate between the Kings. For I love this Church and city, which it has pleased God to make my spiritual spouse and country; this my people here I embrace with truly parental affection, and am most reluctant to be separated from them. But should the honour of the Cardinalship, which was bestowed upon me unexpectedly, and without my knowledge, oblige me to return to Rome, (as it certainly will,) that I may there serve in the vocation with

Digitized by Google

which God hath called me, it will not withdraw my thoughts and my love from a people who will always remain seated in my inmost heart. Being then at Carpentras, and daily hearing many things of you which excited partly my grief, and partly, too, some hope, leading me not to despond, that you and I, who were formerly in true religion of one mind towards God, might, by the same God looking more benignly upon us, return to the same cordial agreement, it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to me, (for so Scripture speaketh, and assuredly whatsoever things are done with an upright and pious mind toward God, are all of the Holy Spirit;) it seemed good to me, I say, to write somewhat to you, and declare to you by letter the care and solicitude of mind which I feel for you. For, dearest brethren, this my affection and good-will towards you is not new, but ever since the time when, by the will of God, I became Bishop of Carpentras, almost twenty-three years ago, and in consequence of the frequent intercourse between you and my people, had, though absent, learned much of you and your manners, even then began I to love your noble city, the order and form of your republic, the worth of its citizens, and, in particular, that quality lauded and experienced by all, your hospitality to strangers and foreigners; and since vicinity often tends in no small degree to beget love, so, in a city, contiguous houses, as well as in the world, adjacent provinces lead to regard among neighbours. Before this time, indeed, you happen not to have derived any benefit from this my affection for you, or to have had any sign and indication of it. You never needed my aid, which assuredly would have been most readily given, but hitherto no occasion presented itself to us.

Now, however, of a truth, not only has an opportunity occurred, but necessity is laid upon me to demonstrate in what way I feel affected towards you, if I would maintain my fidelity towards Almighty God, and Christian charity towards my neighbour. For, after it was brought to my ears that certain crafty men, enemies of Christian unity and peace, had in like manner, as they had previously done in some towns and villages of the brave Helvetii, cast among you, and in your

Digitized by Google

city, the wicked seeds of discord, had turned the faithful people of Christ aside from the way of their fathers and ancestors, and from the perpetual sentiments of the Catholic Church, and filled all places with strife and sedition, (such is always the appropriate course of those who seek new power and new honours for themselves, by assailing the authority of the Church,) I declare before Almighty God, who is always present beholding my inmost thoughts, that I was exceedingly grieved and affected with a kind of double pity, when, on the one hand, methought I heard the groans of the Church our mother, weeping and lamenting at being deprived at once of so many and so dear children; and, on the other, dearest brethren, I was concerned at your losses and dangers. For well knew I, that such innovators on things ancient and well established, such disturbances, such dissensions, were not only pestiferous to the souls of men, (which, however, is the greatest of all evils,) but pernicious also to private and public affairs. This you have had the means of learning for yourselves, being instructed by the event. What then? Since my love towards you, and my piety to God, compel me, as a brother to brethren, and friend to friends, freely to lay before you the inmost feelings of my mind, I would earnestly entreat you, that that goodness which you are always wont to evince, you would show to me, on the present occasion, by receiving and reading my letter not grudgingly. For I hope, that if you will only be pleased to attend impartially to what I write, you will in no small measure approve, if not of my advice, at least of an intention, certainly pure and simple, and above all things, desirous of your salvation, and perceive, that I am seeking not my own, but your good and advantage.

I will not, however, begin with subtle and puzzling disputations, which St Paul styles philosophy, warning believers in Christ to guard against being deceived by it, and by which those men have misled you, when, among the unwary, they boasted of certain hidden interpretations of Scripture, dignifying their fraud and malice with the noble, indeed, but false and inappropriate, name of learning and

Digitized by Google

wisdom. I will set forth things which are bright and clear, and which have in them no hiding-place of error, no winding of fraud and fallacy; such, indeed, truth always is. For it both shines in darkness, and is perspicuous to every man, and is most easily perceived alike by learned and unlearned, and especially in matters of Christian doctrines, rests not on syllogisms, or quibbles on words, but on humility, reverence, and obedience toward God. For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the joinings of soul and spirit, to the inmost parts of the joints and marrow, not ensnaring souls by perplexing argument, but by the interposition of a certain heavenly affection of the heart, making itself plain and patent to our minds, so that to understand it, it is not so much human reason, as God, who calls us to Himself, and worketh in us. To Him, the Father of all true intelligence, I humbly pray that He would, of His goodness, give such assistance to me in speaking, and to you in perceiving, as may again unite us to Himself in one heart and one mind.

And that we may begin with what we deem most seasonable, I presume, dearest brethren, that both you and I, and all else besides who have put their faith and hope in Christ, do, and have done so, for this one reason, viz., that they may obtain salvation for themselves and their souls—not a salvation which is mortal, and will quickly perish, but one which is ever during and immortal, which is truly attainable only in heaven, and by no means on earth. Our task, accordingly, is thus divided—having first laid the foundation of faith, we must thereafter labour here in order that we may rest yonder; we must cast seed into the earth, that we may afterwards be able to reap in heaven; and in whatever works, or whatever studies we have exercised ourselves here, may ultimately obtain similar and fit fruits of our works and labours in another life. And since the way of Christ is arduous, and the method of leading a life conformable to His laws and precepts very difficult, (because we are enjoined to withdraw our minds from the contamination of earthly pleasures, and fix them on this one object—to

Digitized by Google

despise the present good which we have in our hands, and aspire to the future, which we see not,) still of such value to each one of us is the salvation of himself and of his soul, that we must bring our minds to decline nothing, however harsh, and endure everything, however laborious, that, setting before ourselves the one hope of our salvation, we may at length, through many toils and anxieties, (the clemency and mercy of God always taking precedence of our doings,) attain to that stable and ever-during salvation.

For this hope, Christ, the herald of the true God, was once received by the world with such universal consent and eagerness; for this reason he is adored and worshipped by us, and truly acknowledged to be God, and the Son of the true God; because, when the minds of men were dead to Almighty God, in whom alone is life, and after living for a little time to the deceitful and fading pleasures of the world, were forthwith doomed utterly, and in every part of their nature, to destruction, He alone, ever since the world began, awoke them from the dead, that is, from this most fatal kind of death, and first himself, choosing to be himself our salvation and deliverance and truth, by submitting to death in the flesh, and shortly after resuming a life no longer mortal, taught and instructed us, by his own example, how, by a way very different from that to which we had been previously accustomed, we should die to this world and the flesh, and live thereafter to God, placing in him our hopes of living well and happily for ever. This is our proper resurrection from the dead,—a resurrection truly worthy of the glory and majesty of God Almighty, and by which not one man or two, but the whole human race, are brought back from a dismal and fatal death of the soul to the same soul's true and heavenly life. Paul, setting this kind of resurrection before himself, and beholding in it the greatest sign and proof of the divinity of Christ, says, "I was separated unto the gospel of God, which he had promised by the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures concerning his Son, begotten, indeed, of the seed of David according to the flesh, but determined and declared to be the Son of God in power by the Spirit of holiness;" that is, by

Digitized by Google

spiritual power, which is the proper power of God, because God does his miracles not by body, but by spirit. For his commanding the winds, and by a word restoring sight to the blind, and raising the dead, were done by a power not corporeal but spiritual, which is also divine. Therefore, Christ was declared the Son of God by this spiritual power, which alone is divine, and also, as Paul subjoins, by the resurrection from the dead—not so much that resurrection by which he raised Lazarus, or the widow's son, or the ruler of the synagogue's daughter, (although these, too, were works of God,) as that by which he delivered Mary Magdalene from seven devils, called Matthew from the receipt of custom, and raised many from an earthly and perishing life; in short, raised the whole human race from sin, and the death of sin, and the power of the darkness of this world, to aspire to, and hope for, light and a celestial relationship—raised up the minds of men when immersed in the mire of earth, and elevated them to heaven. And this greatest benefit of Jesus Christ towards us, and principal proof therein of his divinity, was both instituted by God in the mission of the Son, and undertaken by the Son himself, and by him given in its own time, and bestowed upon us, that we, being aided in Christ alone, with all divine and human counsels, helps, and virtues, might present our souls to God in safety. So high is the excellence, so remarkable the price, so great the worth of this thing, viz., the soul of man, that, in order to its not being lost, but gained both to God himself and to us, the laws of universal nature having been utterly disturbed, and the order of things changed, God descended to the earth, that he might become man, and man was raised to heaven, that he might be a God.

We all, therefore, (as I said,) believe in Christ in order that we may find salvation for our souls, *i.e.*, life for ourselves: than this there can be nothing more earnestly to be desired, no blessing more internal, more close and familiar to us. For, in proportion to the love which each man bears to himself, is his salvation dear to him; if it be neglected and cast away, what prize, pray, of equal value can possibly be acquired? What will a man give in exchange for

Digitized by Google

his soul? saith the Lord; or what will it profit a man should he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? This possession, therefore, so large, so dear, so precious to every man as is his soul, we must use every effort to retain; since all the other blessings which we desire are external, and alien to us, this one good of a preserved soul is not only ours, but truly we ourselves are that very good. He who has neglected and lost it will not be able to have any other good which he can enjoy, the very being who ought to enjoy it having already lost himself.

Moreover, we obtain this blessing of complete and perpetual salvation by faith alone in God and in Jesus Christ. When I say by faith alone, I do not mean, as those inventors of novelties do, a mere credulity and confidence in God, by which, to the seclusion of charity and the other duties of a Christian mind, I am persuaded that in the cross and blood of Christ all my faults are unknown; this, indeed, is necessary, and forms the first access which we have to God, but it is not enough. For we must also bring a mind full of piety towards Almighty God, and desirous of performing whatever is agreeable to him; in this, especially, the power of the Holy Spirit resides. This mind, though sometimes it proceeds not to external acts, is, however, inwardly prepared of itself for well-doing, and shows a prompt desire to obey God in all things, and this in us is the true habit of divine justice. For what else does this name of justice signify, or what other meaning and idea does it present to us, if regard is not had in it to good works? For Scripture says, that "God sent his Son to prepare a people acceptable to himself, zealous of good works;" and in another place it says, that we may be built up in Christ unto good works. If, then, Christ was sent that we, by well-doing, may, through him, be accepted of God, and that we may be built up in him unto good works; surely the faith which we have in God through Jesus Christ not only enjoins and commands us to confide in Christ, but to confide, working or resolved to work well in him. For faith is a term of full and ample signification, and not only includes in it credulity and confidence, but

Digitized by Google

also the hope and desire of obeying God, together with love, the head and mistress of all the virtues, as has been most clearly manifested to us in Christ, in which love the Holy Spirit properly and peculiarly resides, or rather himself is love, since God is love. Wherefore, as without the Holy Spirit, so also without love, nought of ours is pleasing and acceptable to God. When we say, then, that we can be saved by faith alone in God and Jesus Christ, we hold that in this very faith love is essentially comprehended as the chief and primary cause of our salvation.

But to leave off disputation, and return to where we left; we have shown you, dearest brethren, or, rather, attempted to show, (for our discourse is not equal to the magnitude of the subject,) how important it is, how deeply it concerns us to secure our soul and its salvation, because our soul is our whole selves, is properly our good and only good, while all other goods are foreign to us, and disjoined from us, and cannot in any degree be enjoyed, if we fail of obtaining this, which is first and truly ours. In order to defend and preserve the interest of their souls, so many most glorious martyrs of Christ in former times have cheerfully laid down this mortal life; so many most holy doctors have made it their business to toil and watch, day and night, that they might lead us into the right way, and establish us in it; the whole Church once endured so many and so grievous injuries and calamities from impious tyrants and governors. All these things, accordingly, were permitted by Almighty God, and were undertaken, endured, and warred by those brave men, true worshippers of Christ, that the Church being, by means of every kind of experiment and trial, beaten, as it were, with numbers of hammers, purified with much fire, heated, melted, consolidated, and worked into shape by so many toils and labours of saints, might for her fidelity obtain the highest favour with God, and the greatest authority among men. This Church hath regenerated us to God in Christ, hath nourished and confirmed us, instructed us what to think, what to believe, wherein to place our hope, and also taught us by what way we must tend towards

Digitized by Google

heaven. We walk in this common faith of the Church, we retain her laws and precepts. And if, at any time, overcome by frailty and inconstancy, we lapse into sin, (would that this happened to us rarely at least, and not too often,) we, however, rise again in the same faith of the Church; and by whatever expiations, penances, and satisfactions, she tells us that our sin is washed away, and we (always by the grace and mercy of God) restored to our former integrity, these methods of expiation and satisfaction we have recourse to and employ—trusting, when we do so, to find a place of mercy and pardon with God. For we do not arrogate to ourselves anything beyond the opinion and authority of the Church; we do not persuade ourselves that we are wise above what we ought to be; we do not show our pride in contemning the decrees of the Church; we do not make a display among the people of towering intellect or ingenuity, or some new wisdom; but (I speak of true and honest Christians) we proceed in humility and in obedience, and the things delivered to us, and fixed by the authority of our ancestors, (men of the greatest wisdom and holiness,) we receive with all faith, as truly dictated and enjoined by the Holy Spirit.

For we know and are assured how great power, how great importance, how great weight, humility has with God—humility, a virtue peculiarly Christian, which Christ our Lord always brought particularly forward in his admonitions and precepts, and acts and miracles, declaring, that for little ones only, that is, the humble, the kingdom of heaven is prepared. For it makes no difference whether we be small or great in stature, but it makes the greatest difference whether we be of a humble or of a haughty mind. The same pride which cast down the angels from heaven impedes men in their journey towards heaven. To that place, whence the angel, a heavenly creature, was expelled because of pride, man, a creature of the earth, is exalted, because of humility, making it plainly appear that humility constitutes both the chief help to our eternal salvation, and the chief support of that sweet and blessed hope with which we tend heavenwards.

Digitized by Google

Since these things are so, dearest brethren, since our salvation, since true life, since eternal felicity, since ourselves, in short, ought to be, in the first place, and above all things, dear to us, since, if we lose ourselves, we shall never more find anything that is truly ours, that is, to delight or belong to us, since no heavier loss, no more fatal evil, no more dreadful calamity, can befall us, than the loss and perdition of our souls, with how great zeal, I ask, with what care and anxiety of mind, ought we to guard against exposing our life and salvation to this great danger? You will surely grant and concede to me, that nothing more pernicious and fearful can happen to any one than the loss of his soul. I presume you will therefore grant also that there is no event, against the occurrence of which we ought to guard with greater zeal and diligence. For, when an evil, if it befalls us, is the worst of all evils, the danger of that evil ought to be dreaded by us as the most fearful of all dangers. The greater the extent of the evil, the greater must be our fear when exposed to it. And as those who fear and shudder at being precipitated into the sea, do not even venture to approach any steep rock hanging over the sea, so those who tremble at the dreadful condemnatory sentence of God, flee above all things from the danger which comes nearest and closest to that eternal misery. Nor do I here at this time maintain that all do not sin, and that as long as we are in this life, we are not all of us in danger, (plainly we are so; we all go astray, and stumble, and fall, sometimes oftener, sometimes more seldom, as each possesses in himself, and from God, the virtue of self-restraint;) nevertheless, other sins, those especially which are done and committed not of fixed purpose, but through frailty, have an easy return to the mercy of Almighty God; but that horrid and dreadful sin, by which depraved worship is offered to God, who ought to be most purely worshipped, and by which false things are thought of Him, the Supreme and only Truth, this, this, I say, is a sin which not only places us in the most immediate peril of eternal death, but also leaves us almost without hope and endeavour to turn aside and shun the peril. For, in our other sins, which are like

Digitized by Google

the billows of life, the anchor of our ship is still safe to keep us from rocks and shipwreck, because we turn our thoughts from time to time towards God, and, stung with compunction for sin, we, with silent groans, and with confession of our iniquity, implore his mercy. And He, as He is full of goodness and clemency, is instantly inclined to pardon, and, after the manner of an affectionate parent, listens appeased to the prayer of his children. But, in this deep and dreadful sin of preposterous and false religion, we no longer leave to ourselves either God or anchor. Wherefore, dearest brethren, if we would be safe, this danger, in particular, we must most carefully and studiously shun.

It may here be said, that since, in regard to what constitutes corrupt or genuine religion, judgments vary; and the opinions of men, especially at this time, are different, one interpreting in this way, and another in that, it would seem to be enough if any one, with sincere mind, adopts the belief which is first presented to him, and submits his own judgment to the judgment of those better skilled and learned than himself. I admit, dearest brethren, that these are the words of simple men, and of men who are by nature of duller intellect; (those who twist and turn them aside from the right path have the greater sin;) for this language is not suited to the wise and wary.. But let me now, for the time, admit that these things are uncertain to all, both learned and unlearned, (though it is far otherwise, for the Catholic Church has a certain rule by which to discriminate between truth and falsehood;) however, let us grant that they are doubtful; since the point in question is jeopardy to our salvation; since we set the highest value upon our souls, *i.e.*, ourselves; and since it is not our fortune or our health, or even our body and this mortal life, which are at stake, (the loss of all which, brave men have often suffered with constancy for Christ and their soul,) but the point to be decided is, whether we are to live eternally most miserable, or most blessed—it behoves us to look round, consider and diligently weigh how we may establish ourselves, (I speak of the thing as doubtful, though, however, it is not;) how, I say, we may stand, where

Digitized by Google

the least fear and danger, and the greatest hope and security appear.

No man, I believe, will deny me this much, that in a matter dubious and uncertain, (one, especially, where the whole of life and salvation is concerned,) we ought rather to adopt and follow the counsel which reason gives, than that which fortuitous rashness casts in our way. Let us see then in which party, and in which sect, there is the greatest danger of removing farther from God, and moving nearer to endless destruction. This point I will treat and expound, as if I saw you still deliberating and not yet certain, whose wishes you ought in preference to follow, or in whose counsels confide.

The point in dispute is, Whether is it more expedient for your salvation, and whether you think you will do what is more pleasing to God, by believing and following what the Catholic Church throughout the whole world, now for more than fifteen hundred years, or (if we require clear and certain recorded notice of the facts) for more than thirteen hundred years, approves with general consent; or innovations introduced within these twenty-five years, by crafty, or, as they think themselves, acute men; but men certainly who are not themselves the Catholic Church? For, to define it briefly, the Catholic Church is that which in all parts, as well as at the present time, in every region of the world, united and consenting in Christ, has been always and everywhere directed by the one Spirit of Christ; in which Church no dissension can exist; for all its parts are connected with each other, and breathe together: But should any dissension and strife arise, the great body of the Church indeed remains the same, but an abscess is formed, by which some corrupted flesh being torn off, is separated from the spirit which animates the body, and no longer belongs in substance to the body Ecclesiastic. I will not here descend to the discussion of single points, or load your ears with a multitude of words and arguments. I will say nothing of the Eucharist, in which we worship the most true body of Christ. Those men, little aware how, in each kind of

Digitized by Google

learning, it is necessary to employ reasons and arguments, endeavour, by means of reasons, which are inapplicable, and drawn from dialectics and vain philosophy, to enclose the very Lord of the universe, and his divine and spiritual power therein, (which is altogether free and infinite,) within the corners of a corporeal nature, circumscribed by its own boundaries. Nor will I speak of confession of sins to a priest, in which confession, that which forms the strongest foundation of our safety, viz., true Christian humility, has both been demonstrated by Scripture, and established and enjoined by the Church; this humility these men have studied calumniously to evade, and presumptuously to cast away. Nor will I say anything either of the prayers of the saints to God for us, or of ours for the dead, though I would fain know what these same men would be at when they despise and deride them. Can they possibly imagine that the soul perishes along with its body? This they certainly seem to insinuate, and they do it still more openly when they strive to procure for themselves a liberty of conduct set loose from all ecclesiastical laws, and a license for their lusts. For, if the soul is mortal, Let us eat and drink, says the Apostle, for to-morrow we die; but if it is immortal, as it certainly is, how, I ask, has the death of the body made so great and so sudden a disruption, that the souls of the dead have no congruity, in any respect, no communion with those of the living, and have forgotten all their relationship to us and common human society? and this, especially, while charity, which is the principal gift of the Holy Spirit to a Christian soul, which is ever kind, ever fruitful, and which, in him who has it, never exists to no purpose, must always remain safe and operative in both lives.

But to leave off controversies, and reserve them for their own time, let us discuss what was first proposed—let us inquire and see which of the two is more conducive to our advantage, which is better in itself, and better fitted to obtain the favour of Almighty God, whether to accord with the whole Church, and faithfully observe her decrees, and laws, and sacraments, or to assent to men seeking dissension

Digitized by Google

and novelty. This is the place, dearest brethren, this the highway where the road breaks off in two directions, the one of which leads us to life, and the other to everlasting death. On this discrimination and choice, the salvation of every man's soul, the pledges of future life, are at stake—whether is our lot to be one of eternal felicity, or of infinite misery? What, then, shall we say? Let us here suppose two persons, one of each class, that is, from each road, let them be placed before the dread tribunal of the Sovereign Judge, and there let their case be examined and weighed, in order to ascertain whether a condemnatory or a saving sentence can justly be pronounced. They will be interrogated whether they were Christians. Both will say that they were. Whether they properly believed in Christ? Both will, in like manner, answer yea. But when they will be examined as to what they believed, and how they believed, (for this investigation, respecting right faith, precedes that concerning life and character,) when a confession of right faith will be exacted of them; he who was educated in the lap and discipline of the Catholic Church will say:—

"Having been instructed by my parents, who had learned it from their fathers and forefathers, that I should, in all things, be obedient to the Catholic Church, and revere and observe its laws, admonitions, and decrees, as if Thou, Thyself, O Lord, hadst made them, and perceiving that almost all who bore the Christian name and title in our days, and before it, and followed thy standards far and wide over the world, were and had been of the same opinion, all of them acknowledging and venerating this very Church, as the mother of their faith, and regarding it as a kind of sacrilege to depart from her precepts and constitution, I studied to approve myself to Thee by the same faith which the Catholic Church keeps and inculcates. And though new men had come with the Scripture much in their mouths and hands, who attempted to stir some novelties, to pull down what was ancient, to argue against the Church, to snatch away and wrest from us the obedience which we all yielded to it, I was still desirous to adhere firmly to that which had been de-

Digitized by Google

livered to me by my parents, and observed from antiquity, with the consent of most holy and most learned Fathers; and although the actual manners of many prelates and ecclesiastics were such as might move my indignation, I did not, therefore, abandon my sentiments. For I concluded, that it was my duty to obey their precepts, which were certainly holy, as Thou, God, hadst commanded in Thy Gospel, while Thou behovedst to be the only Judge of their life and actions; and, especially, since I was myself stained by the many sins which were manifest to Thee on my forehead, I could not be a fit judge of others. For these sins, I now stand before Thy tribunal, imploring not strict justice, O Lord, but rather Thy mercy and readiness to forgive."

Thus will this one plead his cause.

The other will be summoned, and will appear. He will be commanded to speak. Supposing him to be one of those who are, or have been, the authors of dissension, he will thus begin his oration:—

"Almighty God, when I beheld the manners of ecclesiastics almost every where corrupt, and saw the priests, nevertheless, from a regard to religion, universally honoured, offended at their wealth, a just indignation, as I consider it, inflamed my mind, and made me their opponent; and when I beheld myself, after having devoted so many years to literature and theology, without that place in the Church which my labours had merited, while I saw many unworthy persons exalted to honours and priestly offices, I betook myself to the assailing of those who I thought were by no means pleasing and acceptable to Thee. And because I could not destroy their power without first trampling on the laws enacted by the Church, I induced a great part of the people to contemn those rights of the Church which had long before been ratified and inviolate. If these had been decreed in General Councils, I said we were not to yield to the authority of Councils; if they had been instituted by ancient Fathers and Doctors, I accused the old Fathers as unskilful and devoid of sound understanding; if by Roman Pontiffs, I

Digitized by Google

affirmed that they had raised up a tyranny for themselves, and falsely assumed the name of Vicegerents of Christ: by all means, in short, I contended that all of us, thy worshippers, should shake off the tyrannical yoke of the Church, which sometimes forbids meats, which observes days, which will have us to confess our sins to priests, which orders vows to be performed, and which binds with so many chains of bondage men made free, O Christ, in Thee; and that we should trust to faith alone, and not also to good works, (which are particularly extolled and proclaimed in the Church,) to procure us righteousness and salvation—seeing, especially, that thou hadst paid the penalty for us, and by thy sacred blood wiped away all faults and crimes, in order that we, trusting to this our faith in thee, might thereafter be able to do, with greater freedom, whatsoever we listed. For I searched the Scriptures more ingeniously than those ancients did, and that more especially when I sought for something which I might wrest against them: Having thus by repute for learning and genius acquired fame and estimation among the people, though, indeed, I was not able to overturn the whole authority of the Church, I was, however, the author of great seditions and schisms in it."

After he has thus spoken, and spoken truly, (for there is no room to lie before that heavenly Judge, though he has kept back much concerning his ambition, avarice, love of popular applause, inward fraud and malice, of which he is perfectly conscious, and which will appear inscribed on his very forehead,) I ask you, my Genevese brethren, whom I long to have of one mind with me in Christ, and in the church of Christ, What judgment, think you, will be passed on these two men and their associates and followers? Is it not certain, that he who followed the Catholic Church will not be judged guilty of any error in this respect? First, Because the Church errs not, and even cannot err, since the Holy Spirit constantly guides her public and universal decrees and Councils. Secondly, Even if she did err, or could have erred, (this, however, it is impious to say

Digitized by Google

or believe,) no such error would be condemned in him who should, with a mind sincere and humble towards God, have followed the faith and authority of his ancestors. But the other, trusting to his own head, having none among the ancient Fathers, and not even general assemblies of the whole Bishops, whom he deems worthy of honour, and to whom he can bring his mind to yield and submit, arrogating all things to himself, more prepared to slander than to speak or teach, after revolting from the common Church, to what does he look as the haven of his fortunes? in what bulwark does he confide? to whom does he trust as his advocates with God, so as not to have great cause of dread that he will be cast into outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth; that is, where he will for ever lament his miseries, and gnash with his teeth against himself, because, when it was in his power, if he had chosen, to avoid that most dreadful calamity, he had neglected to do so? Every person can understand for himself, what wretched and dismal companions grief and fury are to pass one's life with; especially when there will never be any end or any limit of the fatal loss—when weeping and wrath shall never cease.

But if all other things might in same way be tolerated and overlooked, how will this be borne, (for this, methinks, there cannot be with God any place for mercy and pardon,) that they attempted to tear the spouse of Christ in pieces, that that garment of the Lord, which heathen soldiers were unwilling to divide, they attempted not only to divide, but to rend? For already, since these men began, how many sects have torn the Church? Sects not agreeing with them, and yet disagreeing with each other—a manifest indication of falsehood, as all doctrine declares. Truth is always one, while falsehood is varied and multiform; that which is straight is simple, that which is crooked has many turns. Can any one who acknowledges and confesses Christ, and into whose heart and mind the Holy Spirit hath shone, fail to perceive that such rending, such tearing of the holy Church,

Digitized by Google

is the proper work of Satan, and not of God? What does God demand of us? What does Christ enjoin? That we be all one in him. Why was given us from heaven that singular and pre-eminent gift of love, a gift divinely implanted in the Christian race only, and not in other nations? Was it not that we might all confess the Lord with one heart and mouth? Do those men suppose that the Christian religion is any thing at all but peace with God, and concord with our neighbour? Let us see what the Lord himself says in John, when interceding with his Father for the disciples: "Holy Father, keep in thy name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are: I ask not for them only, but for those also who are to believe in me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they too may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, as we also are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one." You see, dearest brethren, and in the clear light of the gospel discern what it really is to be a Christian, since our faith towards God, and all the glory of God, both his with us, and ours with him, consists solely in this unity; since this is the only thing which Christ requires and asks of the Father concerning us—considering that his labours, his toils, his frail human body assumed for us, his cross and his death will produce fruit, both to the glory of God, (his first desire,) and to our salvation, (for which he was about to die,) if we shall be one among ourselves, and one in him. For this the Catholic Church always labours, for this she strives, viz., our concord and unity in the same Spirit, that all men, however divided by space or time, and so incapable of coming together as one body, may yet be both cherished and ruled by one Spirit, who is always and everywhere the same. To this Catholic Church and Holy Spirit those, on the contrary, are professed adversaries who attempt to break unity, to introduce various

Digitized by Google

spirits, to dissolve consent, and banish concord from the Christian religion, attempting this, with an eagerness and a zeal, by machinations and arts, which no language can sufficiently express. I will not, indeed, pray against them that the Lord would destroy all deceitful lips and high-sounding tongues; nor, likewise, that he would add iniquity to their iniquity, but that he would convert them, and bring them to a right mind, I will earnestly entreat of the Lord, my God, as I now do.

And I beg and exhort you, my Genevese brethren, after the mists of error have at length cleared away from the eyes of your mind, and the light been displayed, that you would raise your eyes to that heaven which God has set before you as your everlasting country, that you would be pleased to return to concord with us, yield faithful homage to the Church, our mother, and worship God with us in one spirit. Nor if our manners perhaps displease you, if, by the fault of some, that splendour of the Church, which ought to be perpetual and untarnished, is somewhat obscured, let that move your minds, or draw you to a different or opposite party. You may, perhaps, hate our persons, (if the gospel allows it,) but you certainly ought not to have a hatred for our faith and doctrine; for it is written, "What they say do." Now, we say nothing more than express our eager desire for your salvation. If this, my dearest Genevese, shall be taken by you in good part, if you will listen favourably to one most desirous of your welfare, assuredly you will not repent of having recovered your former favour with God and praise with men. I, as is my part, and as my good-will towards you dictates, will be a constant suppliant to God for you—an unworthy one, indeed, through my own defects, but, perhaps, love will make me worthy. And then, whatever I possibly can do, although it is very small, still if I have in me any talent, skill, authority, industry, I make a tender of all to you and your interests, and will regard it as a great favour to myself, should you be able to reap any fruit and advantage from my labour, and assistance in things human and divine.

Digitized by Google

It only remains to beg of you to receive the messenger, who bears this letter to you, with the civility and kindness which your own humanity and the law of nations, and, above all, Christian meekness, require and demand. While this will be honourable to you, it will also be extremely agreeable to me. God guide and mercifully defend you, my dearest brethren.

Carpentras, XV. Cal. Apr. (18*th March*) 1539.

Digitized by Google

REPLY

BY

JOHN CALVIN

TO

LETTER BY CARDINAL SADOLET

TO THE

SENATE AND PEOPLE OF GENEVA.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

REPLY BY CALVIN

TO

CARDINAL SADOLET'S LETTER.

JOHN CALVIN TO JAMES SADOLET, CARDINAL,—HEALTH.

In the great abundance of learned men whom our age has produced, your excellent learning and distinguished eloquence having deservedly procured you a place among the few whom all, who would be thought studious of liberal arts, look up to and revere, it is with great reluctance I bring forward your name before the learned world, and address to you the following expostulation. Nor, indeed, would I have done it if I had not been dragged into this *arena* by a strong necessity. For I am not unaware how reprehensible it would be to show any eagerness in attacking a man who has deserved so well of literature, nor how odious I should become to all the learned were they to see me stimulated by passion merely, and not impelled by any just cause, turning my pen against one whom, for his admirable endowments, they, not without good reason, deem worthy of love and honour. I trust, however, that after explaining the nature of my undertaking, I shall not only be exempted from all blame, but there will not be an individual who will not admit that the cause which I have undertaken I could not on any account have abandoned without basely deserting my duty.

You lately addressed a Letter to the Senate and People of Geneva, in which you sounded their inclination as to whether, after having once shaken off the yoke of the Roman Pontiff, they would submit to have it again imposed upon them. In that letter, as it was not expedient to wound the feelings of those whose favour you required to gain your

Digitized by Google

cause, you acted the part of a good pleader; for you endeavoured to soothe them by abundance of flattery, in order that you might gain them over to your views. Any thing of obloquy and bitterness you directed against those whose exertions had produced the revolt from that tyranny. And here (so help you) you bear down full sail upon those who, under pretence of the gospel, have by wicked arts urged on the city to what you deplore as the subversion of religion and of the Church. I, however, Sadolet, profess to be one of those whom with so much enmity you assail and stigmatise. For though religion was already established, and the form of the Church corrected, before I was invited to Geneva, yet having not only approved by my suffrage, but studied as much as in me lay to preserve and confirm what had been done by Viret and Farel, I cannot separate my case from theirs. Still, if you had attacked me in my private character, I could easily have forgiven the attack in consideration of your learning, and in honour of letters. But when I see that my ministry, which I feel assured is supported and sanctioned by a call from God, is wounded through my side, it would be perfidy, not patience, were I here to be silent and connive.

In that Church I have held the office first of Doctor, and then of Pastor. In my own right, I maintain, that in undertaking these offices I had a legitimate vocation. How faithfully and religiously I have performed them, there is no occasion for now showing at length. Perspicuity, erudition, prudence, ability, not even industry, will I now claim for myself, but that I certainly laboured with the sincerity which became me in the work of the Lord, I can in conscience appeal to Christ, my Judge, and all his angels, while all good men bear clear testimony in my favour. This ministry, therefore, when it shall appear to have been of God, (as it certainly shall appear, after the cause has been heard,) were I in silence to allow you to tear and defame, who would not condemn such silence as treachery? Every person, therefore, now sees that the strongest obligations of duty—obligations which I cannot evade—constrain me to

Digitized by Google

meet your accusations, if I would not with manifest perfidy desert and betray a cause with which the Lord has entrusted me.

For though I am for the present relieved of the charge of the Church of Geneva, that circumstance ought not to prevent me from embracing it with paternal affection—God, when he gave it to me in charge, having bound me to be faithful to it for ever. Now, then, when I see the worst snares laid for that Church, whose safety it has pleased the Lord to make my highest care, and grievous peril impending if not obviated, who will advise me to await the issue silent and unconcerned? How heartless, I ask, would it be to wink in idleness, and, as it were, vacillating at the destruction of one whose life you are bound vigilantly to guard and preserve? But more on this point were superfluous, since you yourself relieve me of all difficulty. For if neighbourhood, and that not very near, has weighed so much with you, that while wishing to profess your love towards the Genevese, you hesitate not so bitterly to assail me and my fame, it will, undoubtedly, by the law of humanity, be conceded to me, while desiring to consult for the public good of a city entrusted to me by a far stronger obligation than that of neighbourhood, to oppose your counsels and endeavours, which I cannot doubt tend to its destruction. Besides, without paying the least regard to the Genevan Church, (though assuredly I cannot cast off that charge any more than that of my own soul,) supposing I were not actuated by any zeal for it, still, when my ministry (which, knowing it to be from Christ, I am bound, if need be, to maintain with my blood) is assailed and falsely traduced, how can it be lawful for me to bear it as if I saw it not?

Wherefore, it is easy not only for impartial readers to judge, but for yourself, also, Sadolet, to consider how numerous and valid the reasons are which have compelled me to engage in this contest, if the name of contest should be given to a simple and dispassionate defence of my innocence against your calumnious accusations. I say *my* innocence, although I cannot plead for myself without, at the same time,

Digitized by Google

including my colleagues, with whom all my measures in that administration were so conjoined, that whatever has been said against them I willingly take to myself. What the feelings are which I have had toward yourself in undertaking this cause, I will study to testify and prove by my mode of conducting it. For I will act so, that all may perceive that I have not only greatly the advantage of you in the goodness and justice of the cause, in conscientious rectitude, heartfelt sincerity, and candour of speech, but have also been considerably more successful in maintaining gentleness and moderation. There will doubtless be some things which will sting, or, it may be, speak daggers to your mind, but it will be my endeavour, *first*, not to allow any harsher expression to escape me than either the injustice of the accusations with which you have previously assailed me, or the necessity of the case may extort; and, *secondly*, not to allow any degree of harshness which may amount to intemperance or passion, or which may, by its appearance of petulance, give offence to ingenuous minds.

And, first, if you had to do with any other person, he would, undoubtedly, begin with the very argument which I have determined altogether to omit. For, without much ado, he would discuss your design in writing, until he should make it plain that your object was anything but what you profess it to be. For, were it not for the great credit you formerly acquired for candour, it is somewhat suspicious that a stranger, who never before had any intercourse with the Genevese, should now suddenly profess for them so great an affection, though no previous sign of it existed, while, as one imbued, almost from a boy, with Romish arts, (such arts as are now learned in the Court of Rome, that forge of all craft and trickery,) educated, too, in the very bosom of Clement, and now, moreover, elected a cardinal, you have many things about you which, with most men, would in this matter subject you to suspicion. Then as to those insinuations by which you have supposed you might win your way into the minds of simple men, any one, not utterly stupid, might easily refute them. But

Digitized by Google

things of this nature, though many will, perhaps, be disposed to believe them, I am unwilling to ascribe to you, because they seem to me unsuitable to the character of one who has been polished by all kinds of liberal learning. I will, therefore, in entering into discussion with you, give you credit for having written to the Genevese with the purest intention as becomes one of your learning, prudence, and gravity, and for having, in good faith, advised them to the course which you believed conducive to their interest and safety. But whatever may have been your intention, (I am unwilling, in this matter, to charge you with anything invidious,) when, with the bitterest and most contumelious expressions which you can employ, you distort, and endeavour utterly to destroy what the Lord delivered by our hands. I am compelled, whether I will or not, to withstand you openly. For then only do pastors edify the Church, when, besides leading docile souls to Christ, placidly, as with the hand, they are also armed to repel the machinations of those who strive to impede the work of God.

Although your Letter has many windings, its whole purport substantially is to recover the Genevese to the power of the Roman Pontiff, or to what you call the faith and obedience of the Church. But as, from the nature of the case, their feelings required to be softened, you preface with a long oration concerning the incomparable value of eternal life. You afterwards come nearer to the point, when you show that there is nothing more pestiferous to souls than a perverse worship of God; and again, that the best rule for the due worship of God is that which is prescribed by the Church, and that, therefore, there is no salvation for those who have violated the unity of the Church unless they repent. But you next contend, that separation from your fellowship is manifest revolt from the Church, and then that the gospel which the Genevese received from us is nothing but a large farrago of impious dogmas. From this you infer what kind of divine judgment awaits them if they attend not to your admonitions. But as it was of the greatest importance to your cause to throw complete discredit on our words, you

Digitized by Google

labour to the utmost to fill them with sinister suspicions of the zeal which they saw us manifest for their salvation. Accordingly, you captiously allege that we had no other end in view than to gratify our avarice and ambition. Since, then, your device has been to cast some stain upon us, in order that the minds of your readers, being preoccupied with hatred, might give us no credit, I will, before proceeding to other matters, briefly reply to that objection.

I am unwilling to speak of myself, but since you do not permit me to be altogether silent, I will say what I can consistent with modesty. Had I wished to consult my own interest, I would never have left your party. I will not, indeed, boast that there the road to preferment had been easy to me. I never desired it, and I could never bring my mind to catch at it; although I certainly know not a few of my own age who have crept up to some eminence—among them some whom I might have equalled, and others outstripped. This only I will be contented to say, it would not have been difficult for me to reach the summit of my wishes, viz., the enjoyment of literary ease with something of a free and honourable station. Therefore, I have no fear that any one not possessed of shameless effrontery will object to me, that out of the kingdom of the Pope I sought for any personal advantage which was not there ready to my hand.

And who dare object this to Farel? Had it been necessary for him to live by his own industry, he had already made attainments in literature, which would not have allowed him to suffer want, and he was of a more distinguished family than to require external aid. As to those of us to whom you pointed as with the finger, it seemed proper for us to reply in our own name. But since you seem to throw out indirect insinuations against all who in the present day are united with us in sustaining the same cause, I would have you understand, that not one can be mentioned for whom I cannot give you a better answer than for Farel and myself. Some of our Reformers are known to you by fame. As to them, I appeal to your own conscience. Think you it was hunger which drove them away from you, and

Digitized by Google

made them in despair flee to that change as a means of bettering their fortunes? But not to go over a long catalogue, this I say, that of those who first engaged in this cause, there was none who with you might not have been in better place and fortune than require on such grounds to look out for some new plan of life.

But come and consider with me for a little what the honours and powers are which we have gained. All our hearers will bear us witness that we did not covet or aspire to any other riches or dignities than those which fell to our lot. Since in all our words and deeds they not only perceived no trace of the ambition with which you charge us; but, on the contrary, saw clear evidence of our abhorring it with our whole heart, you cannot hope that by one little word their minds are to be so fascinated as to credit a futile slander in opposition to the many certain proofs with which we furnished them. And to appeal to facts rather than words,—the power of the sword, and other parts of civil jurisdiction, which bishops and priests, under the semblance of immunity, had wrested from the magistrate and claimed for themselves, have not we restored to the magistrate? All their usurped instruments of tyranny and ambition have not we detested, and struggled to abolish? If there was any hope of rising, why did we not craftily dissemble, so that those powers might have passed to us along with the office of governing the Church? And why did we make such exertion to overturn the whole of that dominion, or rather butchery, which they exercised upon souls, without any sanction from the Word of God? How did we not consider that it was just so much lost to ourselves? In regard to ecclesiastical revenues, they are still in a great measure swallowed up by these whirlpools. But if there was a hope that they will one day be deprived of them, (as at length they certainly must,) why did we not devise a way by which they might come to us? But when with clear voice we denounced as a thief any bishop who, out of ecclesiastical revenues, appropriated more to his own use than was necessary for a frugal and sober subsistence; when we protested

Digitized by Google

that the Church was exposed to a deadly poison, so long as pastors were loaded with an affluence under which they themselves might ultimately sink, when we declared it inexpedient that these revenues should fall into their possession; finally, when we counselled that as much should be distributed to ministers as might suffice for a frugality befitting their order, not superabound for luxury, and that the rest should be dispensed according to the practice of the ancient Church; when we showed that men of weight ought to be elected to manage these revenues, under an obligation to account annually to the Church and the magistracy, was this to entrap any of these for ourselves, or was it not rather voluntarily to shake ourselves free of them? All these things, indeed, demonstrate not what we are, but what we wished to be. But if these things are so plainly and generally known, that not one iota can be denied, with what face can you proceed to upbraid us with aspiring to extraordinary wealth and power, and this especially in the presence of men to whom none of those things are unknown? The monstrous lies which persons of your order spread against us among their own followers we are not surprised at, (for no man is present who can either reprimand or venture to refute them,) but where men have been eye-witnesses of all the things which we have above mentioned, to try to persuade them of the contrary is the part of a man of little discretion, and strongly derogates from Sadolet's reputation for learning, prudence, and gravity. But if you think that our intention must be judged by the result, it will be found that the only thing we aimed at was, that the kingdom of Christ might be promoted by our poverty and insignificance. So far are we from having abused His sacred name to purposes of ambition.

I pass in silence many other invectives which you thunder out against us, (open mouthed,) as it is said. You call us crafty men, enemies of Christian unity and peace, innovators on things ancient and well established, seditious, alike pestiferous to souls, and destructive both publicly and privately to society at large. Had you wished to escape rebuke, you either ought not, for the purpose of exciting prejudice, to have

Digitized by Google

attributed to us a magniloquent tongue, or you ought to have kept your own magniloquence considerably more under check. I am unwilling, however, to dwell on each of these points; only I would have you to consider how unbecoming, not to say illiberal, it is, thus in many words to accuse the innocent of things, which by one word can be instantly refuted; although to inflict injury on man is a small matter, when compared with the indignity of that contumely, which, when you come to the question, you offer to Christ and his word. When the Genevese, instructed by our preaching, escaped from the gulf of error in which they were immersed, and betook themselves to a purer teaching of the gospel, you call it defection from the truth of God; when they threw off the tyranny of the Roman Pontiff, in order that they might establish among themselves a better form of Church, you call it a desertion from the Church. Come, then, and let us discuss both points in their order.

As to your preface, which, in proclaiming the excellence of eternal blessedness, occupies about a third part of your Letter, it cannot be necessary for me to dwell long in reply. For although commendation of the future and eternal life is a theme which deserves to be sounded in our ears by day and by night, to be constantly kept in remembrance, and made the subject of ceaseless meditation, yet I know not for what reason you have so spun out your discourse upon it here, unless it were to recommend yourself by giving some indication of religious feeling. But whether, in order to remove all doubt concerning yourself, you wished to testify that a life of glory seriously occupies your thoughts, or whether you supposed that those to whom you wrote required to be excited and spurred on by a long commendation of it, (for I am unwilling to divine what your intention may have been,) it is not very sound theology to confine a man's thoughts so much to himself, and not to set before him, as the prime motive of his existence, zeal to illustrate the glory of God. For we are born first of all for God, and not for ourselves. As all things flowed from him, and subsist in him, so, says Paul, (Rom. xi. 36,) they ought to be referred to him. I acknow-

Digitized by Google

ledge, indeed, that the Lord, the better to recommend the glory of his name to men, has tempered zeal for the promotion and extension of it, by uniting it indissolubly with our salvation. But since he has taught that this zeal ought to exceed all thought and care for our own good and advantage, and since natural equity also teaches that God does not receive what is his own, unless he is preferred to all things, it certainly is the part of a Christian man to ascend higher than merely to seek and secure the salvation of his own soul. I am persuaded, therefore, that there is no man imbued with true piety, who will not consider as insipid that long and laboured exhortation to zeal for heavenly life, a zeal which keeps a man entirely devoted to himself, and does not, even by one expression, arouse him to sanctify the name of God. But I readily agree with you that, after this sanctification, we ought not to propose to ourselves any other object in life than to hasten towards that high calling; for God has set it before us as the constant aim of all our thoughts, and words, and actions. And, indeed, there is nothing in which man excels the lower animals, unless it be his spiritual communion with God in the hope of a blessed eternity. And, generally, all we aim at in our discourses is to arouse men to meditate upon it, and aspire to it.

I have also no difficulty in conceding to you, that there is nothing more perilous to our salvation than a preposterous and perverse worship of God. The primary rudiments, by which we are wont to train to piety those whom we wish to gain as disciples to Christ, are these; viz., not to frame any new worship of God for themselves at random, and after their own pleasure, but to know that the only legitimate worship is that which he himself approved from the beginning. For we maintain, what the sacred oracle declared, that obedience is more excellent than any sacrifice, (1 Sam. xv. 22.) In short, we train them, by every means, to be contented with the one rule of worship which they have received from his mouth, and bid adieu to all fictitious worship.

Therefore, Sadolet, when you uttered this voluntary con-

Digitized by Google

fession, you laid the foundation of my defence. For if you admit it to be a fearful destruction to the soul, when, by false opinions, divine truth is turned into a lie, it now only remains for us to inquire which of the two parties retains that worship of God which is alone legitimate. In order that you may claim it for your party, you assume that the most certain rule of worship is that which is prescribed by the Church, although, as if we here opposed you, you bring the matter under consideration, in the manner which is usually observed in regard to doubtful questions. But, Sadolet, as I see you toiling in vain, I will relieve you from all trouble on this head. You are mistaken in supposing that we desire to lead away the people from that method of worshipping God which the Catholic Church always observed. You either labour under a delusion as to the term Church, or, at least, knowingly and willingly give it a gloss. I will immediately show the latter to be the case, though it may also be that you are somewhat in error. First, in defining the term, you omit what would have helped you, in no small degree, to the right understanding of it. When you describe it as that which in all parts, as well as at the present time, in every region of the earth, being united and consenting in Christ, has been always and every where directed by the one Spirit of Christ, what comes of the Word of the Lord, that clearest of all marks, and which the Lord himself, in pointing out the Church, so often recommends to us? For seeing how dangerous it would be to boast of the Spirit without the Word, he declared that the Church is indeed governed by the Holy Spirit, but in order that that government might not be vague and unstable, he annexed it to the Word. For this reason Christ exclaims, that those who are of God hear the word of God—that his sheep are those which recognise his voice as that of their Shepherd, and any other voice as that of a stranger, (John x. 27.) For this reason the Spirit, by the mouth of Paul, declares, (Eph. ii. 20,) that the Church is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. Also, that the Church is made holy to the Lord, by the washing of water in the word of life. The

Digitized by Google

same thing is declared still more clearly by the mouth of Peter, when he teaches that people are regenerated to God by that incorruptible seed, (1 Pet. i. 23.) In short, why is the preaching of the gospel so often styled the kingdom of God, but because it is the sceptre by which the heavenly King rules his people?

Nor will you find this in the Apostolical writings only, but whenever the Prophets foretell the renewal of the Church, or its extension over the whole globe, they always assign the first place to the Word. For they tell that from Jerusalem will issue forth living waters, which being divided into four rivers, will inundate the whole earth, (Zech. xiv. 8.) And what these living waters are, they themselves explain when they say, "That the law will come forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem," (Is. ii. 3.) Well, then, does Chrysostom admonish us to reject all who, under the pretence of the Spirit, lead us away from the simple doctrine of the gospel—the Spirit having been promised not to reveal a new doctrine, but to impress the truth of the gospel on our minds. And we, in fact, experience in the present day how necessary the admonition was. We are assailed by two sects, which seem to differ most widely from each other. For what similitude is there in appearance between the Pope and the Anabaptists? And yet, that you may see that Satan never transforms himself so cunningly, as not in some measure to betray himself, the principal weapon with which they both assail us is the same. For when they boast extravagantly of the Spirit, the tendency certainly is to sink and bury the Word of God, that they may make room for their own falsehoods. And you, Sadolet, by stumbling on the very threshold, have paid the penalty of that affront which you offered to the Holy Spirit, when you separated him from the Word. For, as if those who seek the way of God were standing where two ways meet, and destitute of any certain sign, you are forced to introduce them as hesitating whether it be more expedient to follow the authority of the Church, or to listen to those whom you call the inventors of new

Digitized by Google

dogmas. Had you known, or been unwilling to disguise the fact, that the Spirit goes before the Church, to enlighten her in understanding the Word, while the Word itself is like the Lydian Stone, by which she tests all doctrines, would you have taken refuge in that most perplexing and thorny question? Learn, then, by your own experience, that it is no less unreasonable to boast of the Spirit without the Word, than it would be absurd to bring forward the Word itself without the Spirit. Now, if you can bear to receive a truer definition of the Church than your own, say, in future, that it is the society of all the saints, a society which, spread over the whole world, and existing in all ages, yet bound together by the one doctrine, and the one Spirit of Christ, cultivates and observes unity of faith and brotherly concord. With this Church we deny that we have any disagreement. Nay, rather, as we revere her as our mother, so we desire to remain in her bosom.

But here you bring a charge against us. For you teach that all which has been approved for fifteen hundred years or more, by the uniform consent of the faithful, is, by our headstrong rashness, torn up and destroyed. Here I will not require you to deal truly and candidly by us, (though this should be spontaneously offered by a philosopher, not to say a Christian.) I will only ask you not to stoop to an illiberal indulgence in calumny, which, even though we be silent, must be extremely injurious to your reputation with grave and honest men. You know, Sadolet, and if you venture to deny, I will make it palpable to all that you knew, yet cunningly and craftily disguised the fact, not only that our agreement with antiquity is far closer than yours, but that all we have attempted has been to renew that ancient form of the Church, which, at first sullied and distorted by illiterate men of indifferent character, was afterwards flagitiously mangled and almost destroyed by the Roman Pontiff and his faction.

I will not press you so closely as to call you back to that form which the Apostles instituted, (though in it we

Digitized by Google

have the only model of a true Church, and whosoever deviates from it in the smallest degree is in error,) but to indulge you so far, place, I pray, before your eyes, that ancient form of the Church, such as their writings prove it to have been in the age of Chrysostom and Basil, among the Greeks, and of Cyprian, Ambrose, and Augustine, among the Latins; after so doing, contemplate the ruins of that Church, as now surviving among yourselves. Assuredly, the difference will appear as great as that which the Prophets describe between the famous Church which flourished under David and Solomon, and that which under Zedekiah and Jehoiakim had lapsed into every kind of superstition, and utterly vitiated the purity of divine worship. Will you here give the name of an enemy of antiquity to him who, zealous for ancient piety and holiness, and dissatisfied with the state of matters as existing in a dissolute and depraved Church, attempts to ameliorate its condition, and restore it to pristine splendour?

Since there are three things on which the safety of the Church is founded, viz., doctrine, discipline, and the sacraments, and to these a fourth is added, viz., ceremonies, by which to exercise the people in offices of piety, in order that we may be most sparing of the honour of your Church, by which of these things would you have us to judge her? The truth of Prophetical and Evangelical doctrine, on which the Church ought to be founded, has not only in a great measure perished in your Church, but is violently driven away by fire and sword. Will you obtrude upon me, for the Church, a body which furiously persecutes everything sanctioned by our religion, both as delivered by the oracles of God, and embodied in the writings of holy Fathers, and approved by ancient Councils? Where, pray, exist among you any vestiges of that true and holy discipline, which the ancient bishops exercised in the Church? Have you not scorned all their institutions? Have you not trampled all the Canons under foot? Then, your nefarious profanation of the sacraments I cannot think of without the utmost horror.

Digitized by Google

Of ceremonies, indeed, you have more than enough, but, for the most part, so childish in their import, and vitiated by innumerable forms of superstition, as to be utterly unavailing for the preservation of the Church. None of these things, you must be aware, is exaggerated by me in a captious spirit. They all appear so openly, that they may be pointed out with the finger wherever there are eyes to behold them. Now, if you please, test us in the same way. You will, assuredly, fall far short of making good the charges which you have brought against us.

In the Sacraments, all we have attempted is to restore the native purity from which they had degenerated, and so enable them to resume their dignity. Ceremonies we have in a great measure abolished, but we were compelled to do so, partly because by their multitude they had degenerated into a kind of Judaism, partly because they had filled the minds of the people with superstition, and could not possibly remain without doing the greatest injury to the piety which it was their office to promote. Still we have retained those which seemed sufficient for the circumstances of the times.

That our discipline is not such as the ancient Church professed we do not deny. But with what fairness is a charge of subverting discipline brought against us by those who themselves have utterly abolished it, and in our attempts to re-instate it in its rights have hitherto opposed us? As to our doctrine, we hesitate not to appeal to the ancient Church. And since, for the sake of example, you have touched on certain heads, as to which you thought you had some ground for accusing us, I will briefly show how unfairly and falsely you allege that these are things which have been devised by us against the opinion of the Church.

Before descending to particulars, however, I have already cautioned you, and would have you again and again consider with what reason you can charge it upon our people, as a fault, that they have studied to explain the Scriptures. For you are aware, that by this study they have thrown such light on the Word of God, that, in this respect, even envy

Digitized by Google

herself is ashamed to defraud them of all praise. You are just as uncandid when you aver that we have seduced the people by thorny and subtle questions, and so enticed them by that philosophy of which Paul bids Christians beware. What? Do you remember what kind of time it was when our Reformers appeared, and what kind of doctrine candidates for the ministry learned in the schools? You yourself know that it was mere sophistry, and sophistry so twisted, involved, tortuous, and puzzling, that scholastic theology might well be described as a species of secret magic. The denser the darkness in which any one shrouded a subject, the more he puzzled himself and others with preposterous riddles, the greater his fame for acumen and learning. And when those who had been formed in that forge wished to carry the fruit of their learning to the people, with what skill, I ask, did they edify the Church?

Not to go over every point, what sermons in Europe then exhibited that simplicity with which Paul wishes a Christian people to be always occupied? Nay, what one sermon was there from which old wives might not carry off more whimsies than they could devise at their own fireside in a month? For, as sermons were then usually divided, the first half was devoted to those misty questions of the schools which might astonish the rude populace, while the second contained sweet stories, or not unamusing speculations, by which the hearers might be kept on the alert. Only a few expressions were thrown in from the Word of God, that by their majesty they might procure credit for these frivolities. But as soon as our Reformers raised the standard, all these absurdities, in one moment, disappeared from amongst us. Your preachers, again, partly profited by our books, and partly compelled by shame and the general murmur, conformed to our example, though they still, with open throat, exhale the old absurdity. Hence, any one who compares our method of procedure with the old method, or with that which is still in repute among you, will perceive that you have done us no small injustice. But had you continued your quotation from Paul a little

Digitized by Google

farther, any boy would easily have perceived that the charge which you bring against us is undoubtedly applicable to yourselves. For Paul there interprets "vain philosophy" (Col. ii. 8) to mean that which preys upon pious souls, by means of the constitutions of men, and the elements of this world: and by these you have ruined the Church.

Even you yourself afterwards acquit us by your own testimony; for among those of our doctrines which you have thought proper to assail, you do not adduce one, the knowledge of which is not essentially necessary for the edification of the Church.

You, in the first place, touch upon justification by faith, the first and keenest subject of controversy between us. Is this a knotty and useless question? Wherever the knowledge of it is taken away, the glory of Christ is extinguished, religion abolished, the Church destroyed, and the hope of salvation utterly overthrown. That doctrine, then, though of the highest moment, we maintain that you have nefariously effaced from the memory of men. Our books are filled with convincing proofs of this fact, and the gross ignorance of this doctrine, which even still continues in all your churches, declares that our complaint is by no means ill founded. But you very maliciously stir up prejudice against us, alleging that, by attributing every thing to faith, we leave no room for works.

I will not now enter upon a full discussion, which would require a large volume; but if you would look into the Catechism which I myself drew up for the Genevese, when I held the office of Pastor among them, three words would silence you. Here, however, I will briefly explain to you how we speak on this subject.

First, We bid a man begin by examining himself, and this not in a superficial and perfunctory manner, but to sist his conscience before the tribunal of God, and when sufficiently convinced of his iniquity, to reflect on the strictness of the sentence pronounced upon all sinners. Thus confounded and amazed at his misery, he is prostrated and humbled before God; and, casting away all self-confidence, groans as if

Digitized by Google

given up to final perdition. Then we show that the only haven of safety is in the mercy of God, as manifested in Christ, in whom every part of our salvation is complete. As all mankind are, in the sight of God, lost sinners, we hold that Christ is their only righteousness, since, by his obedience, he has wiped off our transgressions; by his sacrifice, appeased the divine anger; by his blood, washed away our stains; by his cross, borne our curse; and by his death, made satisfaction for us. We maintain that in this way man is reconciled in Christ to God the Father, by no merit of his own, by no value of works, but by gratuitous mercy. When we embrace Christ by faith, and come, as it were, into communion with him, this we term, after the manner of Scripture, the righteousness of faith.

What have you here, Sadolet, to bite or carp at? Is it that we leave no room for works? Assuredly we do deny that, in justifying a man, they are worth one single straw. For Scripture everywhere cries aloud, that all are lost; and every man's own conscience bitterly accuses him. The same Scripture teaches, that no hope is left but in the mere goodness of God, by which sin is pardoned, and righteousness imputed to us. It declares both to be gratuitous, and finally concludes that a man is justified without works, (Rom. iv. 7.) But what notion, you ask, does the very term Righteousness suggest to us, if respect is not paid to good works? I answer, if you would attend to the true meaning of the term *justifying* in Scripture, you would have no difficulty. For it does not refer to a man's own righteousness, but to the mercy of God, which, contrary to the sinner's deserts, accepts of a righteousness for him, and that by not imputing his unrighteousness. Our righteousness, I say, is that which is described by Paul, (2 Cor. v. 19,) that God hath reconciled us to himself in Jesus Christ. The mode is afterwards subjoined—by not imputing sin. He demonstrates that it is by faith only we become partakers of that blessing, when he says that the ministry of reconciliation is contained in the gospel. But faith, you say, is a general term, and has a larger signification. I answer, that Paul, whenever

Digitized by Google

he attributes to it the power of justifying, at the same time restricts it to a gratuitous promise of the divine favour, and keeps it far removed from all respect to works. Hence his familiar inference—if by faith, then not by works. On the other hand—if by works, then not by faith.

But, it seems, injury is done to Christ, if, under the pretence of his grace, good works are repudiated; he having come to prepare a people acceptable to God, zealous of good works, while, to the same effect, are many similar passages which prove that Christ came in order that we, doing good works, might, through him, be accepted by God. This calumny, which our opponents have ever in their mouths, viz., that we take away the desire of well-doing from the Christian life by recommending gratuitous righteousness, is too frivolous to give us much concern. We deny that good works have any share in justification, but we claim full authority for them in the lives of the righteous. For, if he who has obtained justification possesses Christ, and, at the same time, Christ never is where his Spirit is not, it is obvious that gratuitous righteousness is necessarily connected with regeneration. Therefore, if you would duly understand how inseparable faith and works are, look to Christ, who, as the Apostle teaches, (1 Cor. i. 30,) has been given to us for justification and for sanctification. Wherever, therefore, that righteousness of faith, which we maintain to be gratuitous, is, there too Christ is, and where Christ is, there too is the Spirit of holiness, who regenerates the soul to newness of life. On the contrary, where zeal for integrity and holiness is not in vigour, there neither is the Spirit of Christ nor Christ himself; and wherever Christ is not, there is no righteousness, nay, there is no faith; for faith cannot apprehend Christ for righteousness without the Spirit of sanctification.

Since, therefore, according to us, Christ regenerates to a blessed life those whom he justifies, and after rescuing them from the dominion of sin, hands them over to the dominion of righteousness, tranforms them into the image of God, and so trains them by his Spirit into obedience to his will, there

Digitized by Google

is no ground to complain that, by our doctrine, lust is left with loosened reins. The passages which you adduce have not a meaning at variance with our doctrine. But if you will pervert them in assailing gratuitous justification, see how unskilfully you argue. Paul elsewhere says (Eph. i. 4) that we were chosen in Christ, before the creation of the world, to be holy and unblameable in the sight of God through love. Who will venture thence to infer, either that election is not gratuitous, or that our love is its cause? Nay, rather, as the end of gratuitous election, so also that of gratuitous justification is, that we may lead pure and unpolluted lives before God. For the saying of Paul is true, (1 Thess. iv. 7,) we have not been called to impurity, but to holiness. This, meanwhile, we constantly maintain, that man is not only justified freely once for all, without any merit of works, but that on this gratuitous justification the salvation of man perpetually depends. Nor is it possible that any work of man can be accepted by God unless it be gratuitously approved. Wherefore, I was amazed when I read your assertion, that love is the first and chief cause of our salvation. O, Sadolet, who could ever have expected such a saying from you? Undoubtedly the very blind, while in darkness, feel the mercy of God too surely to dare to claim for their love the first cause of their salvation, while those who have merely one spark of divine light feel that their salvation consists in nothing else than their being adopted by God. For eternal salvation is the inheritance of the heavenly Father, and has been prepared solely for his children. Moreover, who can assign any other cause of our adoption than that which is uniformly announced in Scripture, viz., that we did not first love him, but were spontaneously received by him into favour and affection?

Your ignorance of this doctrine leads you on to the error of teaching that sins are expiated by penances and satisfactions. Where, then, will be that one expiatory victim, from which, if we depart, there remains, as Scripture testifies, no more sacrifice for sin? Search through all the divine oracles which we possess; if the blood of Christ alone is uniformly

Digitized by Google

set forth as purchasing satisfaction, reconciliation, and ablution, how dare you presume to transfer so great an honour to your works? Nor have you any ground for ascribing this blasphemy to the Church of God. The ancient Church, I admit, had its satisfactions, not those, however, by which sinners might atone to God and ransom themselves from guilt, but by which they might prove that the repentance which they professed was not feigned, and efface the remembrance of that scandal which their sin had occasioned. For satisfactions were not regularly prescribed to all and sundry, but to those only who had fallen into some heinous wickedness.

In the case of the Eucharist, you blame us for attempting to confine the Lord of the universe, and his divine and spiritual power, (which is perfectly free and infinite,) within the corners of a corporeal nature with its circumscribed boundaries. What end, pray, will there be to calumny? We have always distinctly testified, that not only the divine power of Christ, but his essence also, is diffused over all, and defined by no limits, and yet you hesitate not to upbraid us with confining it within the corners of corporeal nature! How so? Because we are unwilling with you to chain down his body to earthly elements. But had you any regard for sincerity, assuredly you are not ignorant how great a difference there is between the two things—between removing the local presence of Christ's body from bread, and circumscribing his spiritual power within bodily limits. Nor ought you to charge our doctrine with novelty, since it was always held by the Church as an acknowledged point. But as this subject alone would extend to a volume, in order that both of us may escape so toilsome a discussion, the better course will be for you to read Augustine's Epistle to Dardanus, where you will find how one and the same Christ more than fills heaven and earth with the vastness of his divinity, and yet is not everywhere diffused in respect of his humanity.

We loudly proclaim the communion of flesh and blood, which is exhibited to believers in the Supper; and we distinctly show that that flesh is truly meat, and that blood truly drink—that the soul, not contented with an imaginary

Digitized by Google

conception, enjoys them in very truth. That presence of Christ, by which we are ingrafted in him, we by no means exclude from the Supper, nor shroud in darkness, though we hold that there must be no local limitation, that the glorious body of Christ must not be degraded to earthly elements; that there must be no fiction of transubstantiating the bread into Christ, and afterwards worshipping it as Christ. We explain the dignity and end of this solemn rite in the loftiest terms which we can employ, and then declare how great the advantages which we derive from it. Almost all these things are neglected by you. For, overlooking the divine beneficence which is here bestowed upon us, overlooking the legitimate use of so great a benefit, (the topics on which it were becoming most especially to dwell,) you count it enough that the people gaze stupidly at the visible sign, without any understanding of the spiritual mystery. In condemning your gross dogma of transubstantiation, and declaring that stupid adoration which detains the minds of men among the elements, and permits them not to rise to Christ, to be perverse and impious, we have not acted without the concurrence of the ancient Church, under whose shadow you endeavour in vain to hide the very vile superstitions to which you are here addicted.

In auricular confession we have disapproved of that law of Innocent, which enjoins every man once a year to pass all his sins in review before his priest. It would be tedious to enumerate all the reasons which induced us to abrogate it. But that the thing was nefarious is apparent even from this, that pious consciences, which formerly boiled with perpetual anxiety, have at length begun, after being freed from that dire torment, to rest with confidence in the divine favour; to say nothing, meanwhile, of the many disasters which it brought upon the Church, and which justly entitle us to hold it in execration. For the present, take this for our answer, that it was neither commanded by Christ, nor practised by the ancient Church. We have forcibly wrested from the hands of the sophists all the passages of Scripture which they had contrived to distort in support of it, while

Digitized by Google

the common books on ecclesiastical history show that it had no existence in an earlier age. The testimonies of the Fathers are to the same effect. It is, therefore, mere deception when you say, that the humility therein manifested was enjoined and instituted by Christ and the Church. For though there appears in it a certain show of humility, it is very far from being true, that every kind of abasement, which assumes the name of humility, is commended by God. Accordingly, Paul teaches, (Col. ii. 18,) that that humility only is genuine which is framed in conformity to the Word of God.

In asserting the intercession of the saints, if all you mean is, that they continually pray for the completion of Christ's kingdom, on which the salvation of all the faithful depends, there is none of us who calls it in question. Accordingly, you have lost your pains in labouring this part so much, but, no doubt, you were unwilling to lose the opportunity of repeating the false asseveration which charges us with thinking that the soul perishes with the body. That philosophy we leave to your Popes and College of Cardinals, by whom it was for many years most faithfully cultivated, and ceases not to be cultivated in the present day. To them also your subsequent remark applies, viz., to live luxuriously, without any solicitude concerning a future life, and hold us miserable wretches in derision, for labouring so anxiously in behalf of the kingdom of Christ. But, in regard to the intercession of the saints, we insist on a point which it is not strange that you omit. For here innumerable superstitions were to be cut off, superstitions which had risen to such a height, that the intercession of Christ was utterly erased from men's thoughts, saints were invoked as gods, the peculiar offices of Deity were distributed among them, and a worship paid to them which differed in nothing from that ancient idolatry which we all deservedly execrate.

As to purgatory, we know that ancient churches made some mention of the dead in their prayers, but it was done seldom and soberly, and consisted only of a few words. It was, in short, a mention in which it was obvious that no-

Digitized by Google

thing more was meant than to attest in passing the affection which was felt toward the dead. As yet, the architects were unborn, by whom your purgatory was built; and who afterwards enlarged it to such a width, and raised it to such a height, that it now forms the chief prop of your kingdom. You yourself know what a hydra of errors thence emerged; you know what tricks superstition has at its own hand devised, wherewith to disport itself; you know how many impostures avarice has here fabricated, in order to milk men of every class; you know how great detriment it has done to piety. For, not to mention how much true worship has in consequence decayed, the worst result certainly was, that while all, without any command from God, were vying with each other in helping the dead, they utterly neglected the congenial offices of charity, which are so strongly enjoined.

I will not permit you, Sadolet, by inscribing the name of Church on such abominations, both to defame her against all law and justice, and prejudice the ignorant against us, as if we were determined to wage war with the Church. For though we admit that in ancient times some seeds of superstition were sown, which detracted somewhat from the purity of the gospel, still you know, that it is not so long ago since those monsters of impiety with which we war were born, or, at least, grew to such a size. Indeed, in attacking, breaking down, and destroying your kingdom, we are armed not only with the energy of the Divine Word, but with the aid of the holy Fathers also.

That I may altogether disarm you of the authority of the Church, which, as your shield of Ajax, you ever and anon oppose to us, I will show, by some additional examples, how widely you differ from that holy antiquity.

We accuse you of overthrowing the ministry, of which the empty name remains with you, without the reality. As far as the office of feeding the people is concerned, the very children perceive that Bishops and Presbyters are dumb statues, while men of all ranks know by experience, that they are active only in robbing and devouring. We are indignant, that in the room of the sacred Supper has been

Digitized by Google

substituted a sacrifice, by which the death of Christ is emptied of its virtues. We exclaim against the execrable traffic in masses, and we complain, that the Supper of the Lord, as to one of its halves, has been stolen from the Christian people. We inveigh against the accursed worship of images. We show that the sacraments are vitiated by many profane notions. We tell how indulgences crept in with fearful dishonour to the cross of Christ. We lament, that by means of human traditions, Christian liberty has been crushed and destroyed. Of these and similar pests, we have been careful to purge the churches which the Lord has committed to us. Expostulate with us, if you can, for the injury which we inflicted on the Catholic Church, by daring to violate its sacred sanctions. The fact is now too notorious for you to gain anything by denying it, viz., that in all these points, the ancient Church is clearly on our side, and opposes you, not less than we ourselves do.

But here we are met by what you say, when, in order to palliate matters, you allege that though your manners should be irregular, that is no reason why we should make a schism in the holy Church. It is scarcely possible that the minds of the common people should not be greatly alienated from you by the many examples of cruelty, avarice, intemperance, arrogance, insolence, lust, and all sorts of wickedness, which are openly manifested by men of your order, but none of those things would have driven us to the attempt which we made under a much stronger necessity. That necessity was, that the light of divine truth had been extinguished, the word of God buried, the virtue of Christ left in profound oblivion, and the pastoral office subverted. Meanwhile, impiety so stalked abroad, that almost no doctrine of religion was pure from admixture, no ceremony free from error, no part, however minute, of divine worship untarnished by superstition. Do those who contend against such evils declare war against the Church, and not rather assist her in her extreme distress? And yet you would take credit for your obedience and humility in refraining, through veneration for the Church, from applying your hand to the removal of

Digitized by Google

these abominations. What has a Christian man to do with that prevaricating obedience, which, while the word of God is licentiously contemned, yields its homage to human vanity? What has he to do with that contumacious and rude humility, which, despising the majesty of God, only looks up with reverence to men? Have done with empty names of virtue, employed merely as cloaks for vice, and let us exhibit the thing itself in its true colours. Ours be the humility, which, beginning with the lowest, and paying respect to each in his degree, yields the highest honour and respect to the Church, in subordination, however, to Christ the Church's head; ours the obedience, which, while it disposes us to listen to our elders and superiors, tests all obedience by the word of God; in fine, ours the Church, whose supreme care it is humbly and religiously to venerate the word of God, and submit to its authority.

But what arrogance, you will say, to boast that the Church is with you alone, and to deny it to all the world besides! We, indeed, Sadolet, deny not that those over which you preside are Churches of Christ, but we maintain that the Roman Pontiff, with his whole herd of pseudo-bishops, who have seized upon the pastor's office, are ravening wolves, whose only study has hitherto been to scatter and trample upon the kingdom of Christ, filling it with ruin and devastation. Nor are we the first to make the complaint. With what vehemence does Bernard thunder against Eugenius and all the bishops of his own age? Yet how much more tolerable was its condition then than now? For iniquity has reached its height, and now those shadowy prelates, by whom you think the Church stands or perishes, and by whom we say that she has been cruelly torn and mutilated, and brought to the very brink of destruction, can bear neither their vices nor the cure of them. Destroyed the Church would have been, had not God, with singular goodness, prevented. For in all places where the tyranny of the Roman Pontiff prevails, you scarcely see as many stray and tattered vestiges as will enable you to perceive that there Churches lie half buried. Nor should you think this absurd, since Paul tells you

Digitized by Google

(2 Thess. ii. 4) that antichrist would have his seat in no other place than in the midst of God's sanctuary. Ought not this single warning to put us on our guard against tricks and devices which may be practised in the name of the Church?

But whatever the character of the men, still you say it is written, "What they tell you, do." No doubt, if they sit in the chair of Moses. But when, from the chair of verity, they intoxicate the people with folly, it is written, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," (Matt. xvi. 6.) It is not ours, Sadolet, to rob the Church of any right which the goodness of God not only has conceded to her, but strictly guarded for her by numerous prohibitions. For, as pastors are not sent forth by Him to rule the Church with a licentious and lawless authority, but are astricted to a certain rule of duty which they must not exceed, so the Church is ordered (1 Thess. v. 21; 1 John iv. 1) to see that those who are appointed over her on these terms faithfully accord with their vocation. But we must either hold the testimony of Christ of little moment, or must hold it impious to infringe in the least degree on the authority of those whom he has invested with such splendid titles! Nay, it is you who are mistaken in supposing that the Lord set tyrants over his people to rule them at pleasure, when he bestowed so much authority on those whom he sent to promulgate the gospel. Your error lies here, viz., in not reflecting that their power, before they were furnished with it, was circumscribed within certain limits. We admit, therefore, that ecclesiastical pastors are to be heard just like Christ himself, but they must be pastors who execute the office entrusted to them. And this office, we maintain, is not presumptuously to introduce whatever their own pleasure has rashly devised, but religiously and in good faith to deliver the oracles which they have received at the mouth of the Lord. For within these boundaries Christ confined the reverence which he required to be paid to the Apostles; nor does Peter (1 Pet. iv. 11) either claim for himself or allow to others anything more than that, as often as they speak among the faithful,

Digitized by Google

they speak as from the mouth of the Lord. Paul, indeed, justly extols (2 Cor. xiii. 10) the spiritual power with which he was invested, but with this proviso, that it was to avail only for edification, was to wear no semblance of domination, was not to be employed in subjugating faith.

Let your Pontiff, then, boast as he may of the succession of Peter: even should he make good his title to it, he will establish nothing more than that obedience is due to him from the Christian people, so long as he himself maintains his fidelity to Christ, and deviates not from the purity of the gospel. For the Church of the faithful does not force you into any other order than that in which the Lord wished you to stand, when it tests you by that rule by which all your power is defined—the order, I say, which the Lord himself instituted among the faithful, viz., that a Prophet holding the place of teacher should be judged by the congregation, [*consessu,*] (1 Cor. xiv. 29.) Whoever exempts himself from this must first expunge his name from the list of Prophets. And here a very wide field for exposing your ignorance opens upon me, since, in matters of religious controversy, all that you leave to the faithful is to shut their own eyes, and to submit implicitly to their teachers. But since it is certain that every soul which depends not on God alone is enslaved to Satan, how miserable must they be who are imbued with such rudiments of faith? Hence, I observe, Sadolet, that you have too indolent a theology, as is almost always the case with those who have never had experience in serious struggles of conscience. For, otherwise, you would never place a Christian man on ground so slippery, nay, so precipitous, that he can scarcely stand a moment if even the slightest push is given him. Give me, I say not some unlearned man from among the people, but the rudest clown, and if he is to belong to the flock of God, he must be prepared for that warfare which He has ordained for all the godly. An armed enemy is at hand, on the alert to engage—an enemy most skilful and unassailable by mortal strength; to resist him, with what guards must not that poor man be defended, with what weapons armed, if he is not

Digitized by Google

to be instantly annihilated? Paul informs us, (Eph. vi. 17,) that the only sword with which he can fight is the word of the Lord. A soul, therefore, when deprived of the word of God, is given up unarmed to the devil for destruction. Now, then, will not the first machination of the enemy be to wrest the sword from the soldier of Christ? And what the method of wresting it, but to set him a doubting whether it be the word of the Lord that he is leaning upon, or the word of man? What will you do for this unhappy being? Will you bid him look round for learned men on whom reclining he may take his rest? But the enemy will not leave him so much as a breathing time in this subterfuge. For when once he has driven him to lean upon men, he will keep urging and repeating his blows until he throws him over the precipice. Thus he must either be easily overthrown, or he must forsake man, and look directly to God. So true it is, that Christian faith must not be founded on human testimony, not propped up by doubtful opinion, not reclined on human authority, but engraven on our hearts by the finger of the living God, so as not to be obliterated by any colouring of error. There is nothing of Christ, then, in him who does not hold the elementary principle, that it is God alone who enlightens our minds to perceive his truth, who by his Spirit seals it on our hearts, and by his sure attestation to it confirms our conscience. This is, if I may so express it, that full and firm assurance commended by Paul, and which, as it leaves no room for doubt, so not only does it not hesitate and waver among human arguments as to which party it ought to adhere, but maintains its consistency though the whole world should oppose.

Hence arises that power of judging which we attribute to the Church, and wish to preserve unimpaired. For how much soever the world may fluctuate and jar with contending opinions, the faithful soul is never so destitute as not to have a straight course to salvation. I do not, however, dream of a perspicacity of faith which never errs in discriminating between truth and falsehood, is never deceived, nor do I figure to myself an arrogance which looks down as from

Digitized by Google

a height on the whole human race, waits for no man's judgment, and makes no distinction between learned and unlearned. On the contrary, I admit that pious and truly religious minds do not always attain to all the mysteries of God, but are sometimes blind in the clearest matters—the Lord, doubtless, so providing, in order to accustom them to modesty and submission. Again, I admit that they have such a respect for all good men, not to say the Church, that they do not easily allow themselves to be separated from any man in whom they have discovered a true knowledge of Christ; so that sometimes they choose rather to suspend their judgment than to rush, on slight grounds, into dissent. I only contend, that so long as they insist on the word of the Lord, they are never so caught as to be led away to destruction, while their conviction of the truth of the word of God is so clear and certain, that it cannot be overthrown by either men or angels. Away, then, with that nugatory simplicity (which you say becomes the rude and illiterate) of looking up and yielding to the beck of those who are more learned! For, besides that the name of faith is undeservedly bestowed on any religious persuasion, however obstinate, which rests any where but in God, who can give such a name to some (I know not what) wavering opinion, which is not only easily wrested from them by the arts of the devil, but fluctuates of its own accord with the temper of the times, and of which no other end can be hoped for than that it will at length vanish away?

As to your assertion, that our only aim in shaking off this tyrannical yoke was to set ourselves free for unbridled licentiousness after, (so help us!) casting away all thoughts of future life, let judgment be given after comparing our conduct with yours. We abound, indeed, in numerous faults, too often do we sin and fall; still, though truth would, modesty will not, permit me to boast how far we excel you in every respect, unless, perchance, you are to except Rome, that famous abode of sanctity, which having burst asunder the cords of pure discipline, and trodden all honour under foot, has so overflowed with all kinds of iniquity, that scarce-

Digitized by Google

ly any thing so abominable has ever been before. We behoved, forsooth, to expose our heads to so many perils and dangers that we might not, after her example, be placed under too severe constraint! But we have not the least objection that the discipline which was sanctioned by ancient canons should be in force in the present day, and be carefully and faithfully observed; nay, we have always protested that the miserable condition into which the Church had fallen was owing to nothing more than to its enervation by luxury and indulgence. For the body of the Church, to cohere well, must be bound together by discipline as with sinews. But how, on your part, is discipline either observed or desired? Where are those ancient canons with which, like a bridle, bishops and presbyters were kept to their duty? How are your bishops elected? after what trial? what examination? what care? what caution? How are they inducted to their office? with what order? what solemnity? They merely take an official oath that they will perform the pastoral office, and this apparently for no other end than that they may add perjury to their other iniquities. Since, then, in seizing upon ecclesiastical offices they seem to enter upon an authority astricted by no law, they think themselves free to do as they please, and hence it is that among pirates and robbers there is apparently more justice and regular government, more effect given to law, than by all your order.

But since, towards the end, a person has been introduced to plead our cause, and you have cited us as defenders to the tribunal of God, I have no hesitation in calling upon you there to meet me. For such is our consciousness of the truth of our doctrine, that it has do dread of the heavenly Judge, from whom, we doubt not, that it proceeded. But it dwells not on those frivolities with which it has pleased you to amuse yourself; certainly very much out of place. For what more unseasonable than after you had come into the presence of God, to set about devising I know not what follies, and framing for us an absurd defence which must instantly fail. In pious minds, as often as that day is suggested, the impression made is too solemn to leave them at leisure so to

Digitized by Google

disport themselves. Therefore, frivolity aside, let us think of that day, in expectation of which the minds of men ought ever to be on the watch. And let us remember, that while it is a day to be desired by the faithful, it is also one at which the ungodly and profane, and those who are despisers of God, may well be alarmed. Let us turn our ears to the clang of that trumpet which even the ashes of the dead shall hear in their tombs. Let us direct our thoughts and minds to that Judge who, by the mere brightness of his countenance, will disclose whatever lurks in darkness, lay open all the secrets of the human heart, and crush all the wicked by the mere breath of his mouth. Consider, now, what serious answer you are to make for yourself and your party: Our cause, as it is supported by the truth of God, will be at no loss for a complete defence. I speak not of our persons, whose safety will be found not in defence, but in humble confession and suppliant deprecation; but in so far as our ministry is concerned, there is none of us who will not be able thus to speak:—

"O Lord, I have, indeed, experienced how difficult and grievous it was to bear the invidious accusations with which I was harassed on the earth; but with the same confidence with which I then appealed to thy tribunal, I now appear before thee, because I know that in thy judgment truth always reigns—that truth by whose assurance supported I first ventured to attempt—with whose assistance provided I was able to accomplish whatever I have achieved in thy Church. They charged me with two of the worst of crimes—heresy and schism. And the heresy was, that I dared to protest against dogmas which they received. But what could I have done? I heard from thy mouth that there was no other light of truth which could direct our souls into the way of life, than that which was kindled by thy Word. I heard that whatever human minds of themselves conceive concerning thy Majesty, the worship of thy Deity, and the mysteries of thy religion, was vanity. I heard that their introducing into the Church instead of thy Word, doctrines sprung from the human brain, was sacrilegious presumption. But when I

Digitized by Google

turned my eyes towards men, I saw very different principles prevailing. Those who were regarded as the leaders of faith neither understood thy Word, nor greatly cared for it. They only drove unhappy people to and fro with strange doctrines, and deluded them with I know not what follies. Among the people themselves, the highest veneration paid to thy Word was to revere it at a distance, as a thing inaccessible, and abstain from all investigation of it. Owing to this supine state of the pastors, and this stupidity of the people, every place was filled with pernicious errors, falsehoods, and superstition. They, indeed, called thee the only God, but it was while transferring to others the glory which thou hast claimed for thy Majesty. They figured and had for themselves as many gods as they had saints, whom they chose to worship. Thy Christ was indeed worshipped as God, and retained the name of Saviour; but where he ought to have been honoured, he was left almost without honour. For, spoiled of his own virtue, he passed unnoticed among the crowd of saints, like one of the meanest of them. There was none who duly considered that one sacrifice which he offered on the cross, and by which he reconciled us to thyself—none who ever dreamed of thinking of his eternal priesthood, and the intercession depending upon it—none who trusted in his righteousness only. That confident hope of salvation which is both enjoined by thy Word, and founded upon it, had almost vanished. Nay, it was received as a kind of oracle, that it was foolish arrogance, and, as they termed it, presumption for any one trusting to thy goodness, and the righteousness of thy Son, to entertain a sure and unfaltering hope of salvation. Not a few profane opinions plucked up by the roots, the first principles of that doctrine which thou hast delivered to us in thy Word. The true meaning of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, also, were corrupted by numerous falsehoods. And then, when all, with no small insult to thy mercy, put confidence in good works, when by good works they strove to merit thy favour, to procure justification, to expiate their sins, and make satisfaction to thee,

Digitized by Google

(each of these things obliterating and making void the virtue of Christ's cross,) they were yet altogether ignorant wherein good works consisted. For, just as if they were not at all instructed in righteousness by thy law, they had fabricated for themselves many useless frivolities, as a means of procuring thy favour, and on these they so plumed themselves, that, in comparison of them, they almost contemned the standard of true righteousness which thy law recommended—to such a degree had human desires, after usurping the ascendancy, derogated, if not from the belief, at least from the authority, of thy precepts therein contained. That I might perceive these things, thou, O Lord, didst shine upon me with the brightness of thy Spirit; that I might comprehend how impious and noxious they were, thou didst bear before me the torch of thy Word; that I might abominate them as they deserved, thou didst stimulate my soul. But in rendering an account of my doctrine, thou seest (what my own conscience declares) that it was not my intention to stray beyond those limits which I saw had been fixed by all thy servants. Whatever I felt assured that I had learned from thy mouth, I desired to dispense faithfully to the Church. Assuredly, the thing at which I chiefly aimed, and for which I most diligently laboured, was, that the glory of thy goodness and justice, after dispersing the mists by which it was formerly obscured, might shine forth conspicuous, that the virtue and blessings of thy Christ (all glosses being wiped away) might be fully displayed. For I thought it impious to leave in obscurity things which we were born to ponder and meditate. Nor did I think that truths, whose magnitude no language can express, were to be maliciously or falsely declared. I hesitated not to dwell at greater length on topics on which the salvation of my hearers depended. For the oracle could never deceive which declares, (John xvii. 3,) 'This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou has sent.'

"As to the charge of forsaking the Church, which they were wont to bring against me, there is nothing of which

Digitized by Google

my conscience accuses me, unless, indeed, he is to be considered a deserter, who, seeing the soldiers routed and scattered, and abandoning the ranks, raises the leader's standard, and recalls them to their posts. For thus, O Lord, were all thy servants dispersed, so that they could not, by any possibility, hear the command, but had almost forgotten their leader, and their service, and their military oath. In order to bring them together, when thus scattered, I raised not a foreign standard, but that noble banner of thine whom we must follow, if we would be classed among thy people.

"Then I was assailed by those who, when they ought to have kept others in their ranks, had led them astray, and when I determined not to desist, opposed me with violence. On this grievous tumults arose, and the contest blazed and issued in disruption. With whom the blame rests it is for thee, O Lord, to decide. Always, both by word and deed, have I protested how eager I was for unity. Mine, however, was a unity of the Church, which should begin with thee and end in thee. For as oft as thou didst recommend to us peace and concord, thou, at the same time, didst show that thou wert the only bond for preserving it. But if I desired to be at peace with those who boasted of being the heads of the Church and pillars of faith, I behoved to purchase it with the denial of thy truth. I thought that any thing was to be endured sooner than stoop to such a nefarious paction. For thy Anointed himself hath declared, that though heaven and earth should be confounded, yet thy word must endure for ever, (Matth. xxiv. 35.) Nor did I think that I dissented from thy Church, because I was at war with those leaders; for thou hast forewarned me, both by thy Son and by the apostles, that that place would be occupied by persons to whom I ought by no means to consent. Christ had predicted not of strangers, but of men who should give themselves out for pastors, that they would be ravenous wolves and false prophets, and had, at the same time, cautioned to beware of them. Where Christ ordered me to beware, was I to lend my aid? And the apostles declared that there would be no enemies of thy Church more pestilential than those

Digitized by Google

from within, who should conceal themselves under the title of pastors, (Matth. vii. 15; Acts xx. 29; 2 Pet. ii. 1; 1 John ii. 18.) Why should I have hesitated to separate myself from persons whom they forewarned me to hold as enemies? I had before my eyes the examples of thy prophets, who I saw had a similar contest with the priests and prophets of their day, though these were undoubtedly the rulers of the Church among the Israelitish people. But thy prophets are not regarded as schismatics, because, when they wished to revive religion which had fallen into decay, they desisted not, although opposed with the utmost violence. They still remained in the unity of the Church, though they were doomed to perdition by wicked priests, and deemed unworthy of a place among men, not to say saints. Confirmed by their example, I too persisted. Though denounced as a deserter of the Church, and threatened, I was in no respect deterred, or induced to proceed less firmly and boldly in opposing those who, in the character of pastors, wasted thy Church with a more than impious tyranny. My conscience told me how strong the zeal was with which I burned for the unity of thy Church, provided thy truth were made the bond of concord. As the commotions which followed were not excited by me, so there is no ground for imputing them to me.

"Thou, O Lord, knowest, and the fact itself has testified to men, that the only thing I asked was, that all controversies should be decided by thy word, that thus both parties might unite with one mind to establish thy kingdom; and I declined not to restore peace to the Church at the expense of my head, if I were found to have been unnecessarily the cause of tumult. But what did our opponents? Did they not instantly, and like madmen, fly to fires, swords, and gibbets? Did they not decide that their only security was in arms and cruelty? Did they not instigate all ranks to the same fury? Did they not spurn at all methods of pacification? To this it is owing that a matter, which might at one time have been settled amicably, has blazed into such a contest. But although, amidst the great confusion, the judgments of men were various, I am freed from all fear, now that we stand at thy

Digitized by Google

tribunal, where equity, combined with truth, cannot but decide in favour of innocence."

Such, Sadolet, is our pleading, not the fictitious one which you, in order to aggravate our case, were pleased to devise, but that the perfect truth of which is known to the good even now, and will be made manifest to all creatures on that day.

Nor will those who, instructed by our preaching, have adhered to our cause, be at a loss what to say for themselves, since each will be ready with this defence :—

"I, O Lord, as I had been educated from a boy, always professed the Christian faith. But at first I had no other reason for my faith than that which then every where prevailed. Thy word, which ought to have shone on all thy people like a lamp, was taken away, or at least suppressed as to us. And lest any one should long for greater light, an idea had been instilled into the minds of all, that the investigation of that hidden celestial philosophy was better delegated to a few, whom the others might consult as oracles—that the highest knowledge befitting plebeian minds was to subdue themselves into obedience to the Church. Then, the rudiments in which I had been instructed were of a kind which could neither properly train me to the legitimate worship of thy Deity, nor pave the way for me to a sure hope of salvation, nor train me aright for the duties of the Christian life. I had learned, indeed, to worship thee only as my God, but as the true method of worshipping was altogether unknown to me, I stumbled at the very threshold. I believed, as I had been taught, that I was redeemed by the death of thy Son from liability to eternal death, but the redemption I thought of was one whose virtue could never reach me. I anticipated a future resurrection, but hated to think of it, as being an event most dreadful. And this feeling not only had dominion over me in private, but was derived from the doctrine which was then uniformly delivered to the people by their Christian teachers. They, indeed, preached of thy clemency towards men, but confined it to those who should show themselves deserving of it. They,

Digitized by Google

moreover, placed this desert in the righteousness of works, so that he only was received into thy favour who reconciled himself to thee by works. Nor, meanwhile, did they disguise the fact, that we are miserable sinners, that we often fall through infirmity of the flesh, and that to all, therefore, thy mercy behoved to be the common haven of salvation; but the method of obtaining it, which they pointed out, was by making satisfaction to thee for offences. Then, the satisfaction enjoined was, first, after confessing all our sins to a priest, suppliantly to ask pardon and absolution; and, secondly, by good to efface from thy remembrance our bad actions. Lastly, in order to supply what was still wanting, we were to add sacrifices and solemn expiations. Then, because thou wert a stern judge and strict avenger of iniquity, they showed how dreadful thy presence must be. Hence they bade us flee first to the saints, that by their intercession thou mightest be rendered exorable and propitious to us.

"When, however, I had performed all these things, though I had some intervals of quiet, I was still far off from true peace of conscience; for, whenever I descended into myself, or raised my mind to thee, extreme terror seized me—terror which no expiations nor satisfactions could cure. And the more closely I examined myself, the sharper the stings with which my conscience was pricked, so that the only solace which remained to me was to delude myself by obliviousness. Still, as nothing better offered, I continued the course which I had begun, when, lo, a very different form of doctrine started up, not one which led us away from the Christian profession, but one which brought it back to its fountain head, and, as it were, clearing away the dross, restored it to its original purity. Offended by the novelty, I lent an unwilling ear, and at first, I confess, strenuously and passionately resisted; for (such is the firmness or effrontery with which it is natural to men to persist in the course which they have once undertaken) it was with the greatest difficulty I was induced to confess that I had all my life long been in ignorance and error. One thing, in particular, made me averse to those new teachers, viz., reverence for the Church.

Digitized by Google

But when once I opened my ears, and allowed myself to be taught, I perceived that this fear of derogating from the majesty of the Church was groundless. For they reminded me how great the difference is between schism from the Church, and studying to correct the faults by which the Church herself was contaminated. They spoke nobly of the Church, and showed the greatest desire to cultivate unity. And lest it should seem they quibbled on the term Church, they showed it was no new thing for Antichrists to preside there in place of pastors. Of this they produced not a few examples, from which it appeared that they aimed at nothing but the edification of the Church, and in that respect were similarly circumstanced with many of Christ's servants whom we ourselves included in the catalogue of saints. For inveighing more freely against the Roman Pontiff, who was reverenced as the Vicegerent of Christ, the Successor of Peter, and the Head of the Church, they excused themselves thus: Such titles as those are empty bugbears, by which the eyes of the pious ought not to be so blinded as not to venture to look at them, and sift the reality. It was when the world was plunged in ignorance and sloth, as in a deep sleep, that the Pope had risen to such an eminence; certainly neither appointed Head of the Church by the word of God, nor ordained by a legitimate act of the Church, but of his own accord, self-elected. Moreover, the tyranny which he let loose against the people of God was not to be endured, if we wished to have the kingdom of Christ amongst us in safety.

"And they wanted not most powerful arguments to confirm all their positions. First, they clearly disposed of every thing that was then commonly adduced to establish the primacy of the Pope. When they had taken away all these props, they also, by the word of God, tumbled him from his lofty height. On the whole, they made it clear and palpable, to learned and unlearned, that the true order of the Church had then perished—that the keys under which the discipline of the Church is comprehended had been altered very much for the worse—that Christian liberty had fallen—in short, that the kingdom of Christ was prostrated when

Digitized by Google

this primacy was reared up. They told me, moreover, as a means of pricking my conscience, that I could not safely connive at these things as if they concerned me not; that so far art thou from patronising any voluntary error, that even he who is led astray by mere ignorance does not err with impunity. This they proved by the testimony of thy Son, (Matth. xv. 14,) 'If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.' My mind being now prepared for serious attention, I at length perceived, as if light had broken in upon me, in what a stye of error I had wallowed, and how much pollution and impurity I had thereby contracted. Being exceedingly alarmed at the misery into which I had fallen, and much more at that which threatened me in the view of eternal death, I, as in duty bound, made it my first business to betake myself to thy way, condemning my past life, not without groans and tears. And now, O Lord, what remains to a wretch like me, but, instead of defence, earnestly to supplicate thee not to judge according to its deserts that fearful abandonment of thy word, from which, in thy wondrous goodness, thou hast at last delivered me."

Now, Sadolet, if you please, compare this pleading with that which you have put into the mouth of your plebeian. It will be strange if you hesitate which of the two you ought to prefer. For the safety of that man hangs by a thread whose defence turns wholly on this—that he has constantly adhered to the religion handed down to him from his forefathers. At this rate, Jews, and Turks, and Saracens, would escape the judgment of God. Away, then, with this vain quibbling at a tribunal which will be erected not to approve the authority of man, but to condemn all flesh of vanity and falsehood, and vindicate the truth of God only.

But were I disposed to contend with you in trifles, what picture might I paint, I say not, of a Pope, or a Cardinal, or any reverend Prelate whatsoever of your faction, (in what colours almost every man of them might, without any great stretch of ingenuity, be exhibited, you well know,) but of any, even the most select among your doctors? For his condemnation, there would, assuredly, be no need either to ad-

Digitized by Google

duce doubtful conjectures against him, or devise false accusations. He would be burdened heavily enough with such as are certainly just. But that I may not seem to imitate what I blame in you, I decline this mode of pleading. I will only exhort these men to turn for once to themselves, and consider with what fidelity they feed the Christian people, who cannot have any other food than the Word of their God. And that they may not flatter themselves too much, because they now act their part with great applause, and for the most part, amid favourable acclamations, let them remember, that they have not yet come to the conclusion; at which, assuredly, they will not have a theatre on which to vend their smoke with impunity, and, by their tricks, ensnare credulous minds, but will stand or fall by the decision of God himself, whose judgment will not be regulated by the popular gale, but by his own inflexible justice; and who will not only inquire into each man's deeds, but put to proof the hidden sincerity or iniquity of his heart. I dare not pronounce on all without exception; and yet, how many of them feel in their consciences, that, in contending against us, they are hiring out their services to men, rather than [giving them] to God?

While, throughout your Letter, you treat us without mercy, towards its conclusion, you pour out the venom of your bitterness upon us with open mouth. But though your invectives by no means hurt us, and have already been partly answered, I would yet ask, what could make you think of accusing us of avarice? Think you our Reformers were so dull as not to perceive from the very outset, that they were entering on a course most adverse to gain and lucre? And, when they charged you with greediness, did they not see that they were necessarily binding themselves to temperance and frugality, if they were not to become ridiculous even to children? When they showed that the method of correcting that greediness was to disburden pastors of their excessive wealth, in order that they might be more at liberty to care for the Church, did they not spontaneously shut

Digitized by Google

against themselves the avenue to wealth? For what riches now remained to which they might aspire? What! Would not the shortest road to riches and honours have been to have transacted with you at the very first, on the terms which were offered? How much would your Pontiff then have paid to many for their silence? How much would he pay for it, even at the present day? If they are actuated in the least degree by avarice, why do they cut off all hope of improving their fortune, and prefer to be thus perpetually wretched, rather than enrich themselves without difficulty, and in a twinkling? But ambition, forsooth, withholds them! What ground you had for this other insinuation I see not, since those who first engaged in this cause could expect nothing else than to be spurned by the whole world, and those who afterwards adhered to it exposed themselves knowingly and willingly to endless insults and revilings from every quarter. But where is this fraud and inward malice? No suspicion of such things cleaves to us. Talk of them rather in your sacred Consistory, where they are in operation every day.

As I hasten to a conclusion, I am compelled to pass by your calumny, that, leaning entirely to our own judgment, we find not in the whole Church one individual to whom we think deference is due. That it is a calumny, I have already sufficiently demonstrated. For, although we hold that the Word of God alone lies beyond the sphere of our judgment, and that Fathers and Councils are of authority only in so far as they accord with the rule of the Word, we still give to Councils and Fathers such rank and honour as it is meet for them to hold, under Christ.

But the most serious charge of all is, that we have attempted to dismember the Spouse of Christ. Were that true, both you and the whole world might well regard us as desperate. But I will not admit the charge, unless you can make out that the Spouse of Christ is dismembered by those who desire to present her as a chaste virgin to Christ,—who are animated by a degree of

Digitized by Google

holy zeal to preserve her spotless for Christ,—who, seeing her polluted by base seducers, recall her to conjugal fidelity,—who unhesitatingly wage war against all the adulterers whom they detect laying snares for her chastity. And what but this have we done? Had not your faction of a Church attempted, nay, violated her chastity, by strange doctrines? Had she not been violently prostituted by your numberless superstitions? Had she not been defiled by that vilest species of adultery, the worship of images? And because, forsooth, we did not suffer you so to insult the sacred chamber of Christ, we are said to have lacerated his Spouse! But I tell you that that laceration, of which you falsely accuse us, is witnessed not obscurely among yourselves;—a laceration not only of the Church, but of Christ himself, who is there beheld miserably mangled. How can the Church adhere to her Spouse, while she has him not in safety? For where is the safety of Christ, while the glory of his justice, and holiness, and wisdom, is transferred elsewhere?

But it seems, before we kindled the strife, all was tranquillity and perfect peace! True! among pastors, and also among the common people, stupor and sloth had caused, that there were almost no controversies respecting religion. But in the schools, how lustily did sophists brawl? You cannot, therefore, take credit for a tranquil kingdom, when there was tranquillity for no other reason than because Christ was silent. I admit, that, on the revival of the gospel, great disputes arose, where all was quietness before. But that is unjustly imputed to our Reformers, who, during the whole course of their proceedings, desired nothing more than that religion being revived, the Churches, which discord had scattered and dispersed, might be gathered together into true unity. And not to go back upon old transactions, what sacrifices did they, on a late occasion, decline to make, merely that they might procure peace to the Churches? But all their efforts are rendered vain by your opposition. For, while they desire peace, that along with it the kingdom of Christ may flourish, and you, on the other hand, think that all which is gained to

Digitized by Google

Christ is lost to you, it is not strange that you strenuously resist. And you have arts by which you can in one day overturn all that they accomplish for the glory of Christ in many months. I will not overwhelm you with words, because one word will make the matter clear. Our Reformers offered to render an account of their doctrine. If overcome in argument, they decline not to submit. To whom, then, is it owing that the Church enjoys not perfect peace, and the light of truth? Go now, and charge us as seditious, in not permitting the Church to be quiet!

But, (that you might not omit any thing which might tend to prejudice our cause,) since, during these few years, many sects have sprung up, you, with your usual candour, lay the blame upon us. See with what fairness, or even with what plausibility! If we deserve hatred on that account, the Christian name also must, in times of old, have deserved it from the ungodly. Therefore, either cease to molest us on this subject, or openly declare that the Christian religion, which begets so many tumults in the world, ought to be banished from the memory of man! It ought not to hurt our cause in the least, that Satan has tried in all ways to impede the work of Christ. It were more to the point to inquire which party has devotedly opposed itself to all the sects which have arisen. It is plain, that while you were idle and fast asleep, we alone bore all the brunt.

The Lord grant, Sadolet, that you and all your party may at length perceive, that the only true bond of Ecclesiastical unity would exist if Christ the Lord, who hath reconciled us to God the Father, were to gather us out of our present dispersion into the fellowship of his body, that so, through his one Word and Spirit, we might join together with one heart and one soul.

Basle, September 1, 1539.

Digitized by Google

ARTICLES

AGREED UPON BY

THE FACULTY OF SACRED THEOLOGY OF PARIS,

IN REFERENCE TO MATTERS OF FAITH AT PRESENT CONTROVERTED;

WITH

THE ANTIDOTE.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ARTICLES

BY

THE THEOLOGICAL FACULTY OF PARIS.

THE DEAN AND FACULTY OF THEOLOGY OF PARIS TO ALL THE FAITHFUL IN CHRIST,—SALVATION.

Perceiving that, through the altercation of Doctors and Preachers with regard to dogmatical points, the great body of the faithful are in accordance with what Paul writes to the Ephesians, "like children carried to and fro with every wind of doctrine," while it is our duty, as much as in us lies, to calm the contending billows of opinion; and being abundantly persuaded of the most holy purpose of His Most Christian Majesty, it has seemed proper to set down briefly, in the following order, what, in reference to the Articles generally controverted, Doctors and Preachers ought to teach, and the rest of the faithful, with the whole Church, believe.

THIS being a magisterial definition, it is to be observed, that proofs are not added, because to do so were to derogate from the ancient privileges of the School of Paris. But for the sake of certain persons of an over-curious temper, who, in the present day, will believe nothing that is not fully proved, I will, though it is superfluous, say something here in passing in confirmation, or in supplement of the decisions written above, and to be written below.

First, the place ought to have very great authority in the Church; and although our masters are deficient in proofs from Scripture, they compensate the defect by another authority which they have, viz., that of the Church, which is

Digitized by Google

equivalent to Scripture, or even (according to the Doctors) surpasses it in certainty. But that our masters, when congregated in one body, are the Church, is proved from hence, that they are like the ark of Noah, in as much as they form a multitude of all kinds of animals.

Secondly, since in the school of Pythagoras the authority of one man prevailed to such a degree that his *ipse dixit* sufficed for proof, how much more ought that which so many of our masters have together, and with one voice pronounced, to suffice? Especially seeing that, before coming to a decision, they chanted a low mass of the Holy Spirit, and that some were illuminated after having broken their fast, and others made zealous by the bile still reigning in the stomach.

ANTIDOTE.

When the Apostle forbids us to be "like children who are carried about with every wind of doctrine," (Eph. iv. 13,) he at the same time prescribes the method by which it may be avoided, viz., by all coming together in "the unity of the faith," which he defines to be the knowledge of the Son of God. Moreover, he elsewhere declares, that "faith cometh by the word of God," (Rom. x. 17.) For which reason, he, in another place, also teaches that believers ought to be built "upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets," (Eph. ii. 20.) And he exhorts the Colossians to continue in the faith grounded and settled, and not to be moved away from the hope of the gospel which they had heard, (Col. i. 23.) Hence, too, the Thessalonians are deservedly commended by Luke, (Acts xvii. 11,) because, though they had with great readiness of mind embraced the doctrine of Paul, they, notwithstanding, brought it to the test of Scripture. Nor in any way could the doctrine of Paul, in another passage, viz., that our faith stands not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God, (1 Cor. ii. 4,) be maintained, unless we depend solely on God; as it is written, "Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live," (Is. lv. 3.) And it is this which the Lord commands by Jeremiah, "He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully," (Jer. xxiii. 28.) Likewise by Peter, "If any

Digitized by Google

man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God," (1 Pet. iv. 11.) Therefore, whenever any controversy arises, the proper course is not to settle or decide it by the will of man, but to set it at rest by the authority of God only. Paul gives intimation of this when he arms us against Satan with no other sword than the "word of God," (Eph. vi. 17.) Christ also points out the same thing to us by his own example. When assailed by Satan, the only resistance which he opposed to him was passages of Scripture, (Matth. iv. 4.) Nor otherwise would the eulogium which Paul pronounces upon it be true, when he declares that it is profitable not only for doctrine and reproof, but for correction, (2 Tim. iii. 16.) Now, therefore, that the world is in tumult from contending opinions, this is the only remedy that we must use. We must, I say, flee to Scripture, or, as Isaiah calls it, (Is. viii. 20,) "to the law and to the testimony," as a sacred anchor, that, in accordance with the Apostle's precept, "we may be like minded one toward another," but still "according to Christ Jesus," (Rom. xv. 5.) In the admirable words of Augustine,—"When an obscure matter is under dispute, no aid being offered by clear and certain passages of sacred Scripture, human presumption, which gains nothing by leaning to either side, ought to restrain itself," (Lib. ii. *De Peccator. Merit. et Remiss. in fin.*[1]) Therefore, in the controverted questions of the present day, let us follow the counsel which, according to Theodoret, (Lib. i. *Hist. Eccles.* cap. 7,) Constantine gave to the Bishops at the Council of Nice—let us seek their determination from the pure oracles of God.

Article I. Of Baptism.

We must believe, with sure and firm faith, that to all, even infants, Baptism is necessary for salvation, and that by means of it the grace of the Holy Spirit is given.

Proof.—Because otherwise there would be no efficacy in

[1] "Ubi enim de re obscurissima disputatur, non adjuvantibus divinarum scripturarum certis clarisque documentis, cohibere se debet humana præsumptio, nihil faciens in partem alteram declinando." *Augustini Opera*, tom. x. p. 70, Ed. Parisiis, 1696.

Digitized by Google

the baptism given by women, which is founded expressly on the belief that baptism is one of the essentials of salvation, though the Council of Carthage declared, without any exception, that women must not presume to baptize. Nay, what is stronger, Doctors still debate, as a difficult question, whether an infant, at the point of death, (*in periculo mortis*,) if water is not at hand, ought to be plunged into a well rather than commended to God, to wait the event; whereas, if baptism is not essential to salvation, the act would be a murder deserving of death. There are also other questions, as to whether, in the absence of ordinary water, an infant ought to be baptized with lotion, or with artificial or distilled waters, rather than left as it is till water be procured; also, whether, in a case of necessity, it be not true baptism to spit in the face! All these questions would not only be superfluous, but foolish also, did we not hold this principle.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE I.

That in baptism remission of sins, as well as the grace of the Holy Spirit, is offered and exhibited to us, all the pious confess. They also acknowledge that infants have need of it, not as a necessary help to salvation, but as a seal divinely appointed to seal upon them the gift of adoption. For Paul teaches that the children of believers are born holy, (1 Cor. vii. 14.) And, indeed, baptism would not be at all suitable to them if their salvation were not already included in this promise,—"I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." For they do not become the sons of God through baptism; but because, in virtue of the promise, they are heirs of adoption, therefore the Church admits them to baptism. And as of old, when the children of the Israelites died before the eighth day, they suffered not by wanting the sacrament of circumcision, so now, provided there is no contumacy or negligence on the part of the parents, the simple promise by which the children of believers are from the womb adopted into the fellowship of the Church suffices for their salvation. For injury is done to Christ if we imagine that the grace of God is impaired by his advent. But God once gave the name of *sons* to all who should be born of Israel, (Ezek. xviii. 4.) Nor

Digitized by Google

do we read that John was baptized, though he was the minister of baptism to others. We ought, therefore, to hold that, as in Abraham, the father of the faithful, the righteousness of faith preceded circumcision, so in the children of the faithful, in the present day, the gift of adoption is prior to baptism. According to the words of the promise, "I will be a God to thy seed," (Gen. xvii. 7.) Baptism, however, is a confirmation of this gift, and a help to our faith.

Article II. Of Free Will.

With the same firmness of faith must it be held, that in man there is a free will with which he can do good or evil, and by means of which, were he even in mortal sin, he is able, with the help of God, to rise again to grace.

Proof.—Because our masters have so determined, after Aristotle and all the philosophers, who place reason in man as mistress instead of the Holy Spirit. And this, moreover, is founded on an invincible reason—that otherwise there would be no merit, merit being a work elicited from the power of free will with the concurring grace of God. And were will not effective of volition, the order of things moving and things moved could not well stand. Besides, we should not be co-operators with God in working out our salvation, did not the motion and action of the will concur with the assistance of grace. For when the Lutherans say that co-operation itself is the gift of God, because the will is reformed so as to consent to God, and when they adduce, in their support, Scripture, and the express words of Augustine, who says, in the beginning of his book, "De Dono Perseverantiæ," that God gives his people grace to adhere to him perseveringly[1]—also in his book, "De Correptione et Gratia," where he says, that there is given to us the grace by which we not only can, but also will, and that effectually;[2] and again, that believers are actuated incessantly

[1] "Asserimus ergo donum Dei esse perseverantiam, qua usque in finem perseveratur in Christo." *August. Op.* t. x. p. 822.

[2] "Fit quippe in nobis per hanc Dei gratiam in bono recipiendo et per-

Digitized by Google

and insuperably by the grace of God—the reply is easy, that the determination of the Faculty is superior to the opinion of one Doctor, according to the expression, "Eyes see more than eye." In like manner, when in opposition to the fundamental principle which I have laid down, viz., that merit is the effect of the power of free will, they adduce another saying of Augustine, that grace is all the merit of the saints[1]—the solution is, that Augustine did not know how our masters were to speak in solving the point.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE II.

Since the Spirit of God declares that every imagination of man's heart from infancy is evil, (Gen. vi. 5; viii. 21;) that there is none righteous, none that understandeth, none that seeketh after God, (Ps. xiv. 3;) but that all are useless, corrupt, void of the fear of God, full of fraud, bitterness, and all kinds of iniquity, and have fallen short of the glory of God, (Rom. iii. 10:) since he proclaims that the carnal mind is enmity against God, and does not even leave us the power of thinking a good thought, (Rom. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iii. 5,) we maintain with Augustine, that man, by making a bad use of free will, lost both himself and it, (Lib. iii. *ad Bonifac.*) Again, that the will being overcome by the corruption into which it fell, nature has no liberty, (*Homil. in Joan.* 53.) Again, that no will is free which is subject to lusts which conquer and enchain it. Likewise, with Ambrose, (*De Fuga Seculi,*) that neither our heart nor our thoughts are in our own power. In like manner, since God declares that it is his own work to renew the heart, out of stone to make it flesh, to write his law on the heart, and put it in the inward parts, to make us to walk in his precepts, to give both good will and the result of it, to put the fear of his name into

severantur tenendo, non solum posse quod volumus, verum etiam velle quod possumus." *August. Op.* t. x. p. 771. The following passage from the same Treatise deserves also to be quoted: "Intelligenda est enim gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum qua sola homines liberantur a malo et sine qua nullum prorsus sive cogitando sive volendo et amando sive agendo faciunt bonum." (Ibid. p. 751.)

[1] "Gratia illis est omne meritum." *August. Op.* t. x. p. 757.

Digitized by Google

our hearts, that we may never withdraw from it; in fine, to finish the work which he has begun in us until the day of Christ, (Ps. li. 12; Ezek. xxxiv. 26; Jer. xxxi. 33; Phil. ii. 13; Jer. xxxii. 39; Ezek. xi. 19; Phil. i. 6;) we again conclude with Augustine, that the children of God are actuated by his Spirit to do whatever is to be done. Also, that they are drawn by him, so as out of unwilling to be made willing. Also, that since the fall it is owing only to the grace of God that man draws near to him, and that it is owing only to the same grace that he does not recede from him, (*De Dono Pers.* c. 7.)[1] Also, that we know not that any good thing which is our own can be found in our will. Also, because, by the magnitude of the first sin, we lost the free will of believing in God and living piously, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, not because we ought not to will and to run, but because God effects both, (Lib. ii. *De Pecc. Mer. et Remiss.*, cap. 18.) Also with St Cyprian, that we ought to glory in nothing, since nothing is ours, (*Epist.* 107, *ad Vital.*)

Article III. Of Penitence.

It is not less certain that to adults, and those having the use of reason, after the commission of mortal sin, penitence is necessary; which penitence consists in contrition, and in sacramental confession, to be made audibly to a priest, and likewise in satisfaction.

Proof.—It is to be noted that the Lutherans do not speak doctrinally of penitence, when they say that it is a turning unto God, which springs from hatred and displeasure at sin and love of righteousness; also, that man ought to renounce his own will that he may be governed by God. Also, that he ought to be humbled by perceiving the wrath of God and the terrors of death. For contrition is sufficient for mortal sins, in this sense, that to each single sin a single act of contrition is commensurate. In regard to confession,

[1] "Post casum autem hominis nonnisi ad gratiam suam Deus voluit pertinere, ut homo accedat ad eum, neque nisi ad gratiam suam pertinere ut homo non recedat ab eo." *August. Op.* t. x. p. 828.

Digitized by Google

it is to be observed that the matter is of divine, but the form is of positive law; on this point not only the Lutherans err, but also the Canonists, who hold that the law of confession is merely positive. But the matter is proved to be of divine obligation by this, that James says, "Confess one to another." This is the raw material; for, were it not brought into form *ab extra*, it would follow that priests ought to confess to laics, since "one another" means reciprocally; or that laics would not be capable of confessing, because then they could not hear the confession of others, but the form was superadded by Pope Innocent, viz., that the confession should be made to one's own priest. This is the magisterial distinction adopted by all Schools. But the necessity of giving satisfaction to God is thus proved—without it there would be no place for what is said of works of supererogation, and, moreover, what the School holds with regard to remission of the fault, and retention of the penance, would be false. And so the Lutherans would make out their point, that there is nothing we can do which we owe not to God; also that we are reconciled to God freely through the satisfaction of Christ. But we ought never to concede this to them, because, as will be seen farther on, it drags too long a tail after it, and, in fact, would leave no room for purgatory.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE III.

The Spirit of God calls us to repentance every where, in the law, the prophets, and the gospel; at the same time, he also defines what he understands by the term, when he orders us to be renewed in our hearts, to be circumcised to the Lord, to be washed, and to cease from wicked pursuits, to loose the bond of iniquity bound within us, to rend our hearts and not our garments, to put off the old man, to renounce our own desires, and be renewed in the image of God; besides enumerating, as the fruits of repentance, acts of charity, and the exercises of a pious and holy life, (Ezek. xviii. 31; Jer. iv. 4; Is. i. 16; lviii. 6; Joel ii. 13; Rom. vi. 6; Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 14.) Of confession to be made in the ear of a priest there is no where

Digitized by Google

any mention. Of satisfaction still less. Nay, it is even certain, that before Innocent the Third, no necessity of confession was imposed on the Christian people; for his decree, made at the Lateran Council, is extant, (*Can. Omnis utriusque sexus.*) Therefore, for about twelve hundred years the Christian Church had no knowledge of the dogma, that to repentance auricular confession was essentially requisite. And the words of Chrysostom are clear: "I do not say that you must confess to your fellow servant; let it be to the Lord," (*Hom.* ii. *in Psal.* 4.) Again, "It is not necessary to confess before witnesses. Let a searching out of sins be made in thought: let the decision be without a witness: let God alone see thee confessing," (*Serm. de Pœnit. et Confess.*) Again, "I call thee not into the view of men. Show thy wounds to God, the best physician, that he may cure them," (*Hom.* v. *Contra Anomœ, Hom.* iv. *de Lazaro.*) I do not, indeed, deny, that the practice of confessing is very ancient. But I say that it was free, as Sozomen relates in his Ecclesiastical History, where he also attests that it was abolished at Constantinople, because a certain matron, under the pretext of confessing, had been caught with a deacon, (*Trip. Hist.*, Lib. ix.) But that a few only confessed is apparent from his mentioning that only one presbyter was allotted to the office in each bishopric. Whence it may easily be inferred, that the practice had arisen from the solemnity used in public repentance. But public repentance does not refer to God in the forum of conscience, but looks to the judgment of the Church, that the sinner may, by some sign, declare before man what his mind is before God. In regard to satisfaction, the Scripture claims, out and out, for Christ this honour, that he is an expiator for sin, that the chastisement of our peace was upon him, that through his name only is obtained forgiveness of sins, (1 John ii. 2; Is. lvii. 5; Acts x. 43.) In regard to ourselves, it is completed gratuitously and without works, since Paul declares it to be our high privilege, that sins are not imputed to us. At the same time, we disap-

Digitized by Google

prove not of the satisfaction which the Church exacts of sinners in token of repentance.

Article IV. Of Justification by Works.

Moreover, a sinner is not justified by faith alone, but also by good works, which are so necessary, that without them no adult can obtain life.

Proof.—First, by a philosophic reason; righteousness is a quality, and therefore no man is righteous out of himself, but on account of the quality of his works. Again, the ratio of part to part is the same as that of whole to whole. But perfect obedience of the law is righteousness. Therefore, partial obedience is a portion of righteousness. But when the Lutherans place the righteousness of faith in the predicament of a relation, saying that we are righteous merely because God accepts us in Christ, according to what Paul teaches the Ephesians, they act contrary to the whole system of philosophy. Again, when they deny that the principle of proportion between the whole and the part applies to this subject, because God promises the reward to none but those who fulfil his law, pronouncing those cursed who offend in any one point, I answer, that one who denies first principles is not to be argued with. Again, we have another demonstration in our favour. The law of contraries is the same; but we are condemned on account of bad works; therefore we are justified on account of good works. When the Lutherans reply, that one single bad work suffices for condemnation, but that a perfect righteousness is requisite for salvation, I answer, that it is sufficient for us to be in part justified by works as above. For when Paul says, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life," we must supply, in the second member of the sentence, "with the merit of works." Another demonstration is, that reward and merit are correlative terms: But God promises a reward for good works: Therefore, works merit eternal life, and consequently justify. When the Lu-

Digitized by Google

therans ridicule this argument, saying that works are rewarded by God, because they are accepted by Him after He has justified man freely, that, therefore, the reward depends on the gratuitous acceptance, and must be subordinate to the righteousness of faith, as the effect to its cause,—I answer, that my mode of arguing was always used, and that, therefore, from long custom, it must be held authoritative, that if God rewards works, works therefore justify.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE IV.

The words of Paul are these: "If they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise is of none effect."—"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed," (Rom. iv. 14, 16.) He had previously said that "the righteousness of God without the law was manifested through the faith of Christ, in all, and upon all them that believe," (Rom. iii. 21.) Likewise, that "all have come short of the glory of God, and are justified freely by his grace," (Rom. iii. 22, 23.) Now, connect this with what he afterwards writes, "If by grace, then it is no more of works; if of works, then it is no more of grace," (Rom. xi. 6.) The reason is, as he teaches in another place, "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt," (Rom. iv. 4.) He repeats the same sentiment to the Ephesians, "By grace are ye saved."—"Not of works, lest any man should boast," (Eph. ii. 8, 9.) What he means by these words he expounds to the Romans, saying, "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered," (Rom. iv. 6, 7.) Likewise, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."—"For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," (2 Cor. v. 19, 21.) We see how he teaches that God justifies men by forgiving their sins. Whence, too, Zacharias terms it, "the knowledge of salvation," (Luke i. 77.) The com-

Digitized by Google

mon mode of interpreting all these passages, with reference to the ceremonial law, is mere trifling; for he everywhere contrasts the proper righteousness of man with the righteousness of faith, as in the Epistle to the Romans, "Going about to establish their own righteousness, they have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." And he subjoins the reason; for the law saith, "The man which doeth those things shall live by them," (Rom. x. 3, 5.) Also, in the Epistle to the Galatians, he uses this argument, "The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," that the promise made to us in Abraham might be fulfilled through faith, (Gal. iii. 12, 13.) In like manner to the Philippians, "Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God, by faith in Christ," (Phil. iii. 9.) We conclude, therefore, with Augustine, that not according to our merits, but according to the mercy of God, the promise of salvation is sure, (*August. in* Ps. lxxxviii. Tract I.) Likewise, with Bernard, that the mercies of the Lord are all our merit, (*Bernard, Serm.* vi.;) or, to speak more clearly, we conclude with Basil the Great, (*Basil, Serm. de Humil.*,) that there is perfect and entire glorying in God, when we acknowledge that we are void of any righteousness of our own, and are justified solely by faith in Christ; as Paul glories, despising his own righteousness, in order that all pride and haughtiness may cease, while man is left without any ground of boasting.

Article V. Of the Transubstantiation of the Bread into Body.

Every Christian is bound to believe, that, in the consecration of the Eucharist, the bread and wine are converted into the true body and blood of Christ, the species of bread and wine only remaining, under which is really contained the body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and suffered on the cross.

Digitized by Google

PROOF.—Because such is the authoritative decision of a General Council which was held by Hildebrand, *alias* Gregory the Seventh. But when the Lutherans ridicule the act of Gregory, bringing forward one Cardinal Breno, his contemporary, who says, that he appointed a fast of three days, and ordered a solemn procession to be made, that he might have a sign from heaven to certiorate him, and yet, without any revelation from heaven, decided that that of which he was uncertain was to be held as an article of faith, I answer, that that Cardinal was envious of the Pope, and, therefore, wrote with a bad intention. Besides, Ambrose teaches this doctrine in his book, *De Sacramentis*. For, when the Lutherans say that that book is childish, and unworthy of Ambrose, and when Erasmus also demonstrates this by many reasons, I answer, it is enough that the name of Ambrose was long stamped upon it, and that the Master of Sentences, whose quotations ought to be held authentic, alleges it to be genuine. When the Lutherans adduce Scripture in their favour, there is an easy solution (by analogy) from the rod of Moses. It is more difficult to obviate the passages which they allege from the Fathers, if it be not enough that the Fathers spoke before the determination of the Council, but that now it is no longer lawful so to speak. Understand, however, that should the Sacrament chance to be gnawed by worms or moths, or corrupted in any other way, in that case, the substance of bread must have miraculously returned.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE V.

The nature of a Sacrament is to exhibit an invisible truth under a visible sign. But should the sign be fallacious, what are we to think of the thing signified by it? The correspondence of the thing with its sign is indicated by Paul, in the following words:—"We being many, are one bread; for we are all partakers of that one bread," (1 Cor. x. 17.) Therefore, that we may learn from the Supper that the flesh of Christ is the food of our soul, it is necessary that the bread be there set forth as an image of the reality; as Paul also says, "The bread which

Digitized by Google

we break is the communion of the body of Christ," (1 Cor. x. 17.) But if what appears there is only an empty appearance of bread, and not the substance, the power and efficacy of the Sacrament are gone. In this way, too, the holy Fathers spoke: Irenæus:[1]—As that which is bread of the earth, on receiving its call from God, is no longer common bread, but Eucharist, consisting of two things, an earthly and a heavenly, (Lib. iv., *advers Valent.*) And a canon of the Council of Nice is as follows:—Let us not be grovellingly intent on the bread and cup set before us, but, with a mind elevated by faith, let us, at that holy table, contemplate the Lamb of God. Cyprian:[2]—When the Lord gives the name of his body to bread, composed of the union of many particles, he indicates, that our people, whose sins he bore, are united. And when he calls wine, squeezed out from bunches of grapes, his body, he intimates that our flock, likewise, are joined together by the admixture of a united multitude, (*in Epist. ad Magnum.*) So also, Fulgentius calls it the sacrament of the bread and cup, (*Fulg. ad Mony.*) In fine, as Augustine says, If the sacraments had no resemblance to the things which they signify, they would certainly not be sacraments, (*Epist.* 23, *ad Bonif.*) Whence, too, some of the Fathers called it bread sanctified in the body of Christ. But of what nature the exhibition of our Lord's body is, we may learn from Augustine, whose words are, "Doubt not that the man Christ is now there, whence he will come in the same visible form and substance with which he was seen to ascend. To that form and substance he undoubtedly gave immortality, but did not destroy its nature.

[1] "Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis percipiens vocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est, sed Eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et cœlesti." Lib. iii. c. xviii.

[2] "Nam quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congestum, populum nostrum quem portabat indicat adunatum, et quando sanguinem suum vinum appellat de botris atque acinis plurimis expressum atque in unum coactum, gregem item nostrum significat commixtione adunatæ multitudinis copulatum." (*Ep.* 75, *ad Magnum.*)

Digitized by Google

For we must beware, not so to raise the divinity of the man, as to destroy the reality of the body," (*in Epist. ad Dard.* 7.) The meaning is, not that we are to think an empty symbol is offered to us, but that if we wish to receive Christ as he is truly given to us, we must raise our hearts upwards.

Article VI. Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The sacrifice of the Mass is, according to the institution of Christ, available for the living and the dead.

Proof.—Because Christ says, "This do." But to do is to sacrifice, according to the passage in Virgil, "When I will do with a calf in place of corn, do you yourself come." As to which signification, see Macrobius. But when the Lutherans deride that subtlety, because Christ spoke with the Apostles in the common Hebrew or Syriac tongue, and the Evangelists wrote in Greek, answer, that the common Latin translation outweighs them. And it is well known that the sense of Scripture must be sought from the determination of the Church. But of the value of sacrifice for the living and the dead we have proof from experience. For many visions have appeared to certain holy monks when asleep, telling them that by means of masses souls had been delivered from Purgatory. Nay, Saint Gregory redeemed the soul of Trajan from the infernal regions.

Antidote to Article VI.

The institution of Christ is, "Take and eat," Matth. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22,) but not *offer*. Therefore, sacrifice is not conformable to the institution of Christ, but is plainly repugnant to it. Besides, it is evident from Scripture that it is the peculiar and proper office of Christ to offer himself; as an apostle says, that by one offering he has for ever perfected those that are sanctified. Also, "that once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Also, that after this sanctification, there remains no more oblation, (Heb. ix. 26; x. 12.) For

Digitized by Google

to this end also was he consecrated a priest after the order of Melchisedec, without successor or colleague, (Heb. v. 6; vii. 21.) Christ, therefore, is robbed of the honour of the priesthood, when the right of offering is transferred to others. Lastly, no man ought to assume this honour unless called by God, as an apostle testifies. But we read of none having been called but Christ. On the other hand, since the promise is destined for those only who communicate in the sacrament, by what right can it belong to the dead?

Article VII. Of Communion in one kind.

To laics, Communion under both kinds is not necessary for salvation; and of old, for certain and just causes, it was rightly enacted by the Church that they should communicate only in one kind, viz. bread.

Proof.—Because there is a danger that the wine might be spilled. But when the Lutherans ask whether the Church was wiser than Christ, in foreseeing an inconvenience for which Christ had not well provided, I answer, that Christ foresaw it well, but was silent, because he wished to try the wisdom of the Church in this matter. There is also another inconvenience. The body of the Lord ought to be preserved in the ciborium to be given to the sick. But if the blood were preserved it would become vinegar, and so, on account of the corruption, would no longer be blood. Nay, the Lutherans would deride us, saying, Is it not very plain that it is wine? And so this would be against the doctrine of transubstantiation. Thirdly, There is this reason, that priests should have some privilege, in order to keep down the pride of the laity. Fourthly, There is force in the argument drawn from concomitance, let the Lutherans prate as they may about our obligation to follow and observe the dispensation of Christ, which he instituted in adaptation to our infirmity. Also, there would be still another danger if the blood were given to be drunk. The taste might beget in the laity a suspicion that it was still wine. And thence many scandals would arise. But if it be argued that the Church

Digitized by Google

has no power to supersede the precepts of Christ, I answer, that the word "drink" ought to be taken in the sense of exhorting, so that it will be a counsel and not a precept. There is another reason which I dare scarcely allege, though it well deserves to be produced. There are some abstemious persons who do not drink wine, and who, however, are not to be deprived of the other species. I deferred producing this reason, because the Lutherans scoff, saying, that if our doctrine is true it is no longer wine, but blood.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE VII.

The command of Christ is, "Drink ye all of it," (Matth. xxvi. 27.) Nay, after he had simply said of the bread, "Take, eat," when he came to the cup he expressly ordered all to drink. Paul declares that he delivered this to the Corinthians as he had received of the Lord, (1 Cor. xi. 23.) The argument which is wont to be derived from concomitance has here no place. For it behoves us to consider not only what Christ gives, but also in what manner, or (if you will) regard must be had to the mode in which the Lord wishes us to communicate with himself. Therefore, as he gives us his body under the bread, so also he gives his blood under the cup. Hence, nothing remains for us but to obey his command by taking from his hands the symbols which he stretches forth to us, that we may enjoy the reality. We being corporeal, he, as Chrysostom reminds us, (*Hom.* 60, *ad Popul.*,) in adaptation to our capacity, dispenses spiritual things to us under the form of visible. This rite was observed in the Church above a thousand years, as the writings of all the Fathers testify. "The flesh," says Tertullian, (*De Resur. Carnis.*,) "is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may be filled with God." And Theodoret relates the words of Ambrose to the Emperor Theodosius, (Lib. iii. *Ecclesiast. Hist.* c. 8.) "How, with such hands, will you take up the sacred body of the Lord? how will you dare to lift the cup of precious blood to your lips?" Jerome says, (*in Soph.*,) "The priests who perform the Eucharist, and distribute to the people the blood of the Lord." Also Chrysostom, (*in* 2 *ad Cor.* c. 9,) "The priest

Digitized by Google

did not, as in the old law, eat part, and give part to the people; but all things which belong to the Eucharist are common to the priest and the people. One body is set before all, and one cup." But there is no controversy as to the observance, which all admit to have been of this description. And that, in the opinion of all, it behoves to be so observed, is evident from the decree of Gelasius, who orders that those who abstain from the cup be kept back from the whole sacrament; for, says he, the division of this mystery is not without great sacrilege, (*Can. Comperimus de Consec. Dist.* 2.) And Cyprian strenuously contends (*Epist.* 2 *de Lapsis*) that this sacrilege ought by no means to be allowed.

Article VIII. Of the Power of Consecrating.

Moreover, to priests only, ordained according to the ritual of the Church, has Christ given the power of consecrating the true body of Christ, and of absolving from sin in the forum of penitence.

Proof.—Because the bishop, in giving ordination, pronounces these words, "We give thee the power of consecrating, and of offering to God expiatory sacrifices." But it is asked, what ritual of the Church our masters mean, since the ceremonies which we use were not in existence among the Apostles, or their contemporaries. To this I answer, that the privilege was given to them by special dispensation. But if any one rejoins concerning their successors, who also, for many years, were neither anointed nor ordained after our way and manner, I say, that the whole of that time ought to be left in doubt, and well deserves to be so, because as yet nothing was concluded concerning transubstantiation.

Antidote to Article VIII.

We acknowledge that priests are stewards of the mysteries of God, (1 Cor. iv. 1,) and, therefore, legitimate dispensers of the Supper; but priests ordained after the ritual of Christ and the Apostles, and also of the ancient Church, in which merely imposition of hands was used, without anointing and other follies, (Acts xiii. 3.) In ordination the thing

Digitized by Google

chiefly to be looked at is the end, and the office to which priests are destined, (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6.) Priests ought, moreover, to be appointed according to the command of God, and the rule of Scripture, not to sacrifice, but to govern the Church, and feed the flock with the word of the Lord, and administer the sacraments. As to the power of absolution, the true doctrine is, that the ministry of reconciliation has been given to true pastors, in order that by their doctrine, *i. e.*, the preaching of the gospel, they may absolve men from their sins by bringing them back into favour with God. This, however, is not affixed to their persons, but to the word, and has, therefore, been given to the word rather than to the men, in order that the remission of grace, by whomsoever proffered, may procure complete absolution in the forum of conscience. For though it is said especially to the Apostles, "Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted unto them," (John xx. 23;) yet, that the keys are given to the whole Church, is acknowledged by the holy Fathers; in particular, by Cyprian and Augustine, to whom the others assent. (*De Simpl. Prælator. Hom.* 50 *et* 124, *in Joan.; Item, De Doctr. Christ.* Lib. i. c. 18.) For remission of sins in Christ, by whomsoever it is announced, is true absolution.

Article IX. Of Intention to Consecrate.

It is certain that priests, even if they be wicked and in mortal sin, consecrate the true body of Christ, if, indeed, they intend to consecrate it.

Proof.—Since otherwise the caution would be superfluous, nay irrational, that the sacrament ought to be adored with implicit faith, that is, under this condition, if the priest, when celebrating mass, had an intention of consecrating, an intention not only habitual, but, at the moment, existing in the very act. But in opposition, it is said, that in this way a priest might annihilate a sacrament. To this I answer, that there is no sacrament when there is no intention. Second Proof.—Because it would be superfluous, nay even

Digitized by Google

foolish, for the Doctors to discuss such questions as these, If there are a hundred hosts and one, and the priest intends to consecrate the hundred only, what would then be the result? Would not one of them remain bread? Moreover, which of them all would, in that case, be set aside as bread? or rather, whether, as the intention was allusive, ought it not to be in like manner inefficacious in all, and will it not be necessary to begin anew? But as to what the Lutherans say about the duty of pronouncing the words distinctly, and with a loud voice, there is nothing in it, because it is more accordant with the dignity of the mystery to repeat them in a low voice.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE IX.

Christ does not say to one, If you wish you shall have my body, and give it to others, but he addresses all alike, when he promises that he will give his body; the promise being directed to those to whom it is said, "Take, eat," (Matth. xxvi. *et alibi.*) Therefore, it is not in the power of any wicked man whatever, nor even in that of the devil, to make this promise fruitless. And to this the expressions of the Fathers refer, when they say that nothing is detracted from the sacrament, and that none of its virtue is lost, whoever be the minister; (*Augustine in all his writings against the Donatists, et alibi.*) We conclude, therefore, that nothing is more absurd than to leave it at the determination, or rather at the caprice, of a wicked minister to deprive the Church of the benefits of Christ as oft as he shall think fit. Nor, indeed, is it less absurd to pretend that priests have the power of consecrating whenever they please, though it should be contrary to the institution of Christ; for the promise is subordinate to the command to which it is annexed. Therefore, those only have the body of Christ who celebrate the sacrament according to the rule laid down by him. And hence we conclude, that the consecration is frivolous, and of no value, when the priest dares to consecrate for himself alone, apart from others; for, "This is my body," are not words of magical incantation, but contain a promise subservient to the action instituted by Christ. Whence, too, it is evident that they act improperly when they mutter in a low

Digitized by Google

whisper, instead of pronouncing, as they ought, openly, and with a clear voice. This is obvious from the context, "Take, eat; this is my body." For which reason, Augustine calls the word of consecration the word of faith, which is preached, (*Hom. in Joan.* 80.)

Article X. Of Confirmation and Unction.

Confirmation and extreme unction are two sacraments instituted by Christ; by means of these the grace of the Holy Spirit is given.

Proof.—For otherwise the Aurelian Council would blaspheme, when it says, (*Refert. de Consecrat.*, cap. 5, *c. Ut jejunii,*) that no man can be a complete Christian who has not been chrismed by Episcopal consecration. Also, Pope Melchiades would blaspheme, when he says that by baptism we are regenerated to life, by confirmation armed for the fight; and much more so, when he says that this sacrament is to be reverenced and held in greater veneration than that of baptism. But another peremptory proof is, that nought is done in the Church with greater pomp and solemnity than the consecration of the holy chrism. Whence it appears, that as well extreme unction as confirmation ought to be held in the highest honour, and ought not to be brought into doubt, as if they were of human invention.

Antidote to Article X.

We read that the Apostles, by the laying on of hands, conferred visible influences of the Spirit, (Acts xix. 6.) But experience demonstrates that this was a temporary gift. Nay, the most ancient writers declare that it ceased immediately after the death of the Apostles. We admit that their successors retained the ceremony of laying on of hands when the young made a confession of their faith. But this was not done in order that it might be regarded as a sacrament instituted by Christ; for Augustine affirms that it is nothing else than prayer, (Lib. iii. *De Bapt. Cont. Donat.* c. 16.) The same account is to be given of extreme unction; for we know that it was the symbol of a temporary gift,

Digitized by Google

which did not last long after the Apostles. The Apostles, in the name of the Lord, anointed those to whom they exhibited the power of the Holy Spirit, as present in the gift of healing, (Mark vi. 13.) James bids this be done, (James v. 14.) But now where is the healing, when men half dead are anointed just as they are breathing their last? Those who now use the symbols without the reality are not imitators, but apes of the Apostles.

Article XI. Of the Miracles of the Saints.

Nor can we doubt that the saints, both during this mortal life, and living in Paradise, work miracles.

Proof.—For it is apparent how the most blessed Virgin raises up infants, that they may be buried in sacred ground, when they would otherwise have their sepulchre with dogs. But when the Lutherans say, that one of the modes in which God punishes the idolatry of the world is, when the devil does miracles under the name of the saints, and, in support of this view, adduce Jerome, who relates that the Egyptians were cured of the bite of serpents, at the tomb of Jeremiah, whom they worshipped as a god, (*in Proœ. Prophet.*,) I answer, that we do not worship the saints as gods, because we adore them only with the adoration of *dulia*. There is also another stronger proof from antiquity. For it was always so done, *e. g.*, in the time of Ambrose, a blind man received his sight at the tombs of Gervasius and Protasius. But when the Lutherans reply, out of Augustine, that this was done to confirm true faith, and not in favour of superstition, I answer, that true faith is to worship the saints, and visit their churches, as will appear from what follows.

Antidote to Article XI.

We know from the Scriptures what the power of miracles is, and to what end they ought to be referred, viz., to confirm the doctrine of the gospel, as it is said in Mark, (xvi. 20,) "The Lord working with them, and confirming the word, with signs following." Also by Luke, in the Acts, (xiv. 3,)

Digitized by Google

the Lord "gave testimony to the word of his grace, and granted signs and wonders to be done by their hands." The legitimate use of miracles, accordingly, is, (Rom. xv. 19,) to receive them as seals of the doctrine of the gospel, and in that way make them subservient to the glory, not of men and angels, but of God only, as Peter said, (Acts iii. 12, 16,) "Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk?"—"The name of Jesus, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong." And when Christ foretold that the reign of Antichrist would be established by miracles, (Matth. xxiv. 24,) and Paul (2 Thess. ii. 9) repeated this prophecy of Christ; we conclude, with Augustine, that God put us on our guard against wonder-workers, (so he terms them,) who, by a pretence of miracles, lead the world away from the unity of the faith, (*Homil. in Joan.* 13.) But a twofold caution must here be observed. For Satan deludes men by numerous impostures, and God even allows many signs to be wrought to punish men for their ingratitude, as Paul testifies, (2 Thess. ii. 9,) and, after Paul, Augustine, *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, c. 119.

Article XII. Of Worshipping Saints.

It is a holy act, and especially acceptable to God, to pray to the blessed mother of God and the saints, who are in heaven, that they may be our advocates and intercessors with God.

Proof.—What would the saints do in heaven, if they did not pray for us? But if they pray, they are, therefore, to be prayed to. The Lutherans deny this consequence. But it is proved by this, that the saints resemble God. Now, God wishes to be worshipped by us; and, therefore, so do the saints. But when the Lutherans say, ironically, that we make the saints very long-eared, the answer is easy. They see the things which are done in the world, by means

Digitized by Google

of the reflected light which they receive from the irradiation of God. A second proof is, that all the Pagans have always had lesser gods for their intercessors. But it is not reasonable that Christians should have fewer privileges than Gentiles. And, hence, it was a mode of correcting their error, when the honour which they gave to their idols was transferred to the saints; as when a Pope changed the name of a temple which was called Pantheon, and called it Pantagius. And, in like manner, on many festival days, Christians, in contempt of the Heathen, get drunk in honour of the saints.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XII.

Scripture requires faith in prayer, (Mark xi. 24.) And Paul expressly adds, that this faith is by the word of God, (Rom. x. 17.) And James forbids us to hesitate in our prayers, (James i. 6.) Now, therefore, if we wish to obey the word of God, we must invoke God only in the name of Christ. For God assures us this is the spiritual worship of his name, and sets forth his Son as the only Mediator; under whose intercession Paul teaches that we have ready access to God, with confidence, (Ps. l. 15; xc. 15; Joel ii. 32; Jer. xxix. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 5.) And another apostle exhorts us to approach the throne of grace, trusting to him as our Advocate, (1 John ii. 1.) Since, therefore, no command exists, enjoining us to seek the intercession of the saints, and no promise is anywhere found, we conclude that this species of prayer is repugnant to the Scripture rule. Besides, neither prophets nor apostles have left us any example of such prayer. Now, let every pious person consider with himself, how perilous it is to attempt a new kind of prayer, not only without sanction from the word of God, but without example. But when the Spirit bids us pray one for another, it is as an exercise of mutual charity in this life, as it is evident from all the passages. But we see how greatly God everywhere abominates Baalim, by which name was meant advocates to whose aid men looked, (Jer. ix. 13; xi. 13; Hosea ii. 8.) Lastly, in addition to this, no man can assert that the

Digitized by Google

ears of the saints are so long that our prayers can reach them. The idea seems little accordant with reason.

Article XIII. Of Veneration of Saints.

Wherefore, the saints, leading a life of blessedness with Christ, are not only to be imitated, but also venerated and prayed to.

Proof.—If there is any truth in the brocard, that common error makes law, veneration of the saints is sufficiently proved; yet, because the Lutherans reply, that in this way the glory of God is transferred to the saints, always keep in mind the distinction of the School, that we worship them only with the worship of *dulia*.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XIII.

Of prayer we have already spoken. And no other veneration of saints is recommended to us in Scripture, but that which is universally due to believers, according to Ps. xv. and cxxxix.; and is to be rendered to them according to the measure of grace. Of the saints, therefore, in proportion as each of them excels in divine gifts, or has been placed by the Lord in a higher rank, we must both feel and speak honourably. But to render worship to them, as the generality are wont to do, is profane superstition, and savours more of the madness of the Gentiles than of what becomes the Church of God. Nay, it is plainly repugnant to the precept, "Thou shalt worship the Lord, and him only shalt thou serve," (Deut. vi. 13; Matt. iv. 10.)

Article XIV. Of Pilgrimages.

And for this reason, it is a religious act devoutly to visit the places dedicated to them.

Proof.—It would be great ingratitude if less honour were paid to the saints than to the idols of the Gentiles; to some of whose temples singular and pre-eminent devotion was paid, as to that of Apollo at Delphi, and Proserpine at Enna in Cilicia. Then, too, it can be proved to be probable that saints are especially present in the places where

Digitized by Google

their sepulchres and remains are, or where they are more highly honoured.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XIV.

Christ abolished all distinction of places, when he said, "The hour cometh, when not at this mountain, or Jerusalem, but everywhere shall the true worshippers worship God in spirit and in truth," (John iv. 21, 23.) For he does not there speak of the preposterous zeal of a few, but shows in what respect we differ from the fathers under the Old Testament. With this sentiment, that of Paul corresponds, "I will, therefore, that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands," (1 Tim. ii. 8.) Those, therefore, revive Judaism, who attach a new sanctity to places, deeming it a part of piety to visit this place or that; indeed, this superstition is worse than Judaism, because Jerusalem was the appointed place of worship. But those men, after the example of idolators, erect for themselves groves and fanes at pleasure. Again, the Son of God was worshipped at Jerusalem, but they consecrate temples to men.

ARTICLE XV. SAINTS MAY BE DULY INVOKED, BEFORE INVOKING GOD.

If any one in a church, or out of a church, has recourse in his prayer, in the first instance, to the blessed Virgin, or any of the saints, he sins not.

PROOF.—First, from the common proverb, that God is not known among the saints. Second, a superstitious devotion, though it be inordinate, may well be excused through ecstacy.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XV.

If it is not lawful at all to have recourse to saints in prayer, it is vain to dispute whether it is to be done first or last. But since Christ is proposed to us as the only Mediator, through whom we ought to approach God, those who, passing him by, or postponing him, betake themselves to the saints, have no excuse for their depravity. Solomon, in the solemn dedication of the temple, thus explains

Digitized by Google

its use, "I have built an house for the name of the Lord God of Israel," (1 Kings viii. 20;) while, without the temple, all the faithful exclaim, "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses; but we will remember the name of the Lord our God," (Ps. xx. 7.)

Article XVI. Of the Worship of the Cross and of Images.

Nor can it in any way be doubted, that, in supplicating Christ and the saints, it is a good and pious work to bend the knee before an image of the cross, and blessed Mary, and the saints.

Proof.—That crucifixes and images of the saints ought to be worshipped with genuflexion, is proved by the authority of the last Council of Nice. For although Gregory admits that Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, did well in forbidding the adoration of them, yet the Council which afterwards followed might infringe on this, as posterior derogate from prior decrees. It is proved, secondly, by reason. For if relics and garments are honoured in memory of saints, the reason is not less applicable to images. The former is justified by common use. The third proof is drawn from analogy, viz., because the people venerate the statues of princes, and even heathen princes. The fourth proof is from miracles; for many images of saints have smiled or wept at the devotion of those praying to them. Some have even spoken. The fifth proof is from the experience of our own sensations. For, in praying before an image, we are more inflamed to devotion, our zeal being excited by its very aspect. The sixth proof is, because it behoved us thus to correct the error of the Gentiles, who bent the knee before their idols, as we now do before the images of the saints.

Antidote to Article XVI.

Concerning images and statues the command of God is, "Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them," (Ex. xx. 5.) Moreover, to bend the knee is the very thing which is signified by the word adoring, (Deut. v. 9.) And

Digitized by Google

from the writings of the Gentiles, their opinion appears plainly to have been, that they prayed to the heavenly gods when they turned toward their images. Augustine even relates the excuses which the idolators of his time were wont to frame, (in Ps. cxiii.) For the vulgar said, that they did not worship the visible object, but the deity which dwelt in it invisibly. But those who had what he terms a more purified religion, said that they worshipped neither the statue nor the demon, but that in the corporeal image they beheld a sign of the reality which they ought to worship. The same may be seen in Eusebius and Lactantius. Since, then, those who, in the present day, prostrate themselves before statues, differ in no respect from old idolators, we conclude from the word of God, and the opinion of ancient fathers, that this practice is openly condemned. And what Augustine says (in Ps. cxiii.) is certainly true, that no one prays or worships beholding an image, without thinking that he is heard by it. For he says, the effect produced, and in a manner extorted by the figure of the members, is, that the mind, living in a body, thinks that the body, which it sees very like its own, has sensation. Hence, when they are placed on an eminence to be seen by those who pray to them, though they want life and sense, yet, by their resemblance to living members and senses, they affect weak minds, so as to seem to live and breathe. For this reason, it was formerly decreed, that there should be no painting in churches, and that nothing which is worshipped or adored should be depicted on walls. Accordingly, Ambrose, speaking of Helena, says, (*Orat. Nat. in Funere Theodo.*) "She found the inscription, she adored the king, certainly not the wood, for this is the heathen error, and the vanity of the wicked."

ARTICLE XVII. OF PURGATORY.

Besides, it is to be firmly believed, and not at all doubted, that there is a purgatory, the souls detained in which are aided by prayer, fasting, alms, and other good works, so as to be more quickly freed from suffering.

Digitized by Google

PROOF.—Because many holy monks and devout matrons have had various apparitions, when souls have said so; as may be seen at length in the Dialogues of Gregory, aye, throughout. But if the Lutherans do, as they say, account such things as nothing, or as the phantasies of a disordered brain, or spectres and impostures with which Satan deceives men, I answer, that they are authenticated by the authority of Gregory, who was a Pope. The second proof is the long prescription. For all the Churches are founded, or at least enriched, with annual donations, on an idea of purgatory. Nay, even the Pagans had a knowledge of it, as appears from their poets, and especially from Ovid. Indeed, if satisfaction is to be made for sins done in this mortal life, it follows that he who is prevented by death must satisfy in another world, and, consequently, that there is a place destined for paying the debts undischarged. It is proved also from natural philosophy; because souls which have attracted ponderous humour from a gross natural body, could not fly off instantly to heaven, unless they were previously desiccated by fire. But when our masters assert that we ought to believe firmly, and without any doubt, a thing which has only an appearance of probability, they have in this followed the rule of law, "Dubious belief is unbelief." It is better, however, to say, that the thing is indubitable. For, grant that the reasons which are adduced are doubtful, still the supervening authority of the Church makes them certain. However, it being once fixed that there is a purgatory, the other thing follows infallibly, viz., that the wretched souls which are there tormented are to be aided by sacrifices of the living, and it must be held, that the mass for the dead, which supposes that souls can be aided by such sacrifices, was not instituted without reason. Accordingly, kind mother Church, when she found nothing in Scripture, chose to abuse the Psalms and passages out of the book of Job, and many parts of the prophets, rather than leave miserable souls without relief.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XVII.

Of purgatory there is not one word in Scripture, and Au-

Digitized by Google

gustine, who in this matter yields to custom, acknowledges that this opinion is supported by no passage of Scripture, unless it be the history concerning the oblation of Judas Maccabeus, although the fact of its not being canonical and of certain authority, both he himself confesses, and Jerome teaches, and universal consent confirms. For the passage, which is wont to be cited, from the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he himself expounds otherwise, as all men of sense see it ought to be otherwise expounded, (1 Cor. iii. 13.) For as the words, *wood, hay, and stubble,* are metaphorical, so, without doubt, the word *fire* is used metaphorically for the trial of the Spirit, under which human doctrines perish, whereas divine truth is proved like gold. But though Augustine allowed himself, as I said, to be ruled by custom, so as not to deny a purgatory, (*August. Ench. ad Laur.* c. 68,) he does not venture to make any positive assertion with regard to it. Nay, he even speaks doubtingly, saying, that it is not incredible, and that its existence may be made a question. Besides, he is not at all consistent with himself; since, in another place, he teaches that souls, when they leave the world, meet with different receptions, the good enjoying delight, while the bad are tormented, (*Idem, in eod. lib. cap. seq.;*) and, moreover, that the rest which is given immediately after death, every one receives the moment he dies, provided he is worthy of it, (*Homil. in Joan.* 49.) But since it is not in the power of any man to determine concerning the souls of the dead, nothing is safer in judging of their state than to hear God himself, who has the power over their state, speaking of it. Scripture then testifying, "That blessed are the dead who die in the Lord," (Rev. xiv. 13,) "for they rest from their labours," teaching that they receive consolation, (Luke xvi. 25,) that they live with Christ, and enjoy the presence of God, (Phil. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 8;) let us take our stand on this doctrine, as to which there is no room for controversy. But the structure of purgatory has just as much solidity as any thing can have which is, in regard to things unknown, fabricated by the brain of man, without the word of God. Assuredly, the prayers by

Digitized by Google

which they usually try to aid souls not being supported by any precept of God, or by any promise, have not that foundation of faith which Paul requires in the prayers of the faithful, (Rom. x. 14.) Nothing is more carefully enjoined upon us in Scripture, than to exercise all the offices of charity towards the living. Of assisting the dead there is no mention. In addition to this, there is not a single example extant, though Scripture mentions the burials of many individuals, and even relates the obsequies of some of them at great length, *(History of the Old Testament, especially the Books of Moses and the Books of Kings.)* Moreover, it is not credible that Scripture, when giving those minute details, omitted that which would have been of principal moment.

Article XVIII. Of the Church and its Authority.

Every Christian is bound firmly to believe, that there is on earth one universal visible Church, incapable of erring in faith and manners, and which, in things which relate to faith and manners, all the faithful are bound to obey.

Proof.—Because the Church can be seen. For the Hierarchy is the infallible sign of the Church. Now, the Hierarchy is at all times visible. Therefore, the Church also is visible. But that the Church cannot be separated from the Hierarchy, I assume as one of the principles of faith. A second proof is from perpetual succession. But perpetual succession, from the days of the Apostles, is known from the catalogue of Popes which Platina gives. For, though Doctors differ, as to the second in succession from Peter, some setting down Clement, others Linus, this being an error in the individual, does not hinder certainty in the generality. The election of Pope Joan is a greater difficulty; for it appears that then some interruption took place. But granting that she then occupied the see on the failure of a male, the same thing is to be said of a time of schism, as when Gregory, and John, and Peter, were antipopes, and, in like manner, when Amadeus was elected on the deposition of Eugenius

Digitized by Google

by a General Council, and afterwards abdicated because Eugenius proved more powerful. In this way a perpetual order of succession will remain. The second branch of the proposition, viz., that the Church cannot err in faith and manners, is proved with difficulty in the visible Church; yet it ought to be a sufficient proof, that whatever the Roman Church has determined is authoritative. But it is proved still better by the fact, that the Church is immediately directed by the Holy Spirit. Now, the Holy Spirit cannot err. Therefore, consequently, neither can the Church. The third proof is from the following article; for since it is to herself that the Church looks in determining all things, nothing would be certain in faith if our doubts were not resolved by her infallibility. Even now, if we had not this for an invincible shield, we should have been vanquished a hundred times by the Lutherans, as they have in their favour an appearance of truth, and press us with strong arguments.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XVIII.

That there is an universal Church, that there has been, from the beginning of the world, and will be even to the end, we all acknowledge. The appearance by which it may be recognised is the question. We place it in the word of God, or, (if any one would so put it,) since Christ is her head, we maintain that, as a man is recognised by his face, so she is to be beheld in Christ: as it is written, "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together," (Matth. xxiv. 28.) Again, "There will be one sheepfold, and one Shepherd," (John x. 16.) But as the pure preaching of the gospel is not always exhibited, neither is the face of Christ always conspicuous, (1 Cor. xi. 19.) Thence we infer that the Church is not always discernible by the eyes of men, as the examples of many ages testify. For in the time of the prophets, the multitude of the wicked so prevailed, that the true Church was oppressed; so also in the time of Christ, we see that the little flock of God was hidden from men, while the ungodly usurped to themselves the name of Church. But what will those, who have eyes

Digitized by Google

so clear that they boast the Church is always visible to them, make of Elijah, who thought that he alone remained of the Church? (1 Kings xix. 10.) In this, indeed, he was mistaken, but it is a proof that the Church of God may be equally concealed from us, especially since we know, from the prophecy of Paul, that defection was predicted, (2 Thess. ii. 3.) Let us hold, then, that the Church is seen where Christ appears, and where his word is heard; as it is written, "My sheep hear my voice," (John x. 27;) but that at the instant when the true doctrine was buried, the Church vanished from the eyes of men. This Church, we acknowledge with Paul, to be the pillar and ground of the truth, (1 Tim. iii.,) because she is the guardian of sound doctrine, and by her ministry propagates it to posterity, that it may not perish from the world. For, seeing she is the spouse of Christ, it is meet that she be subject to him. And, as Paul declares, (Eph. v. 24; 2 Cor. xi. 2, 3,) her chastity consists in not being led away from the simplicity of Christ. She errs not, because she follows the truth of God for her rule; but if she recedes from this truth, she ceases to be a spouse, and becomes an adulteress. Let those who tie down the Church to power in its ordinary sense, and to other external pomp, hear what Hilary says on that subject: "We do wrong in venerating the Church of God in roofs and edifices. Is it doubtful that in these Antichrist will sit? Safer to me are mountains, and woods, and lakes, and dungeons, and whirlpools; for in these, either hidden or immersed, did prophets prophesy."

Article XIX.

That to the visible Church belong definitions in doctrine. If any controversy or doubt arises with regard to any thing in the Scriptures, it belongs to the foresaid Church to define and determine.

Proof.—Horrible confusion would arise, if the Church had not the power of pronouncing a definitive sentence on disputed doctrines, as in the present day the Lutherans

Digitized by Google

would fain have a voice in the Chapter, and would boast the word of the Lord, did we not oppose to them this reply, which has no exception,—That it belongs to the Church to determine ultimately, without contradiction. In no other way could we shut their mouth. Then we ought to know that Scripture is like a nose of wax, because it can be bent hither and thither. But the determination of the Church is fixed and stable. For if the heretics choose to cavil at one, the next day another more stringent can be adopted.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XIX.

A definite rule, as far as regards particular Churches, is prescribed to us by Paul, when he says, (1 Cor. xiv. 29,) "Let the prophets speak two or three, and let the others judge. If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace." If any dissension arise among the Churches, we acknowledge that the legitimate method of establishing concord, which has always been observed, is for the pastors to assemble, and define from the word of God what is to be followed. But if we are to hold the determinations of the visible Church for oracles, it was the visible Church which Micah stood alone in resisting, (1 Kings xxii. 10.) It was also the visible Church which said, "Come and let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for the law shall not perish from the priest, nor the counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet," (Jer. xviii. 18.) In short, in the time of Christ, the visible Church was represented by the high priest and his council, (John xviii. 28.) For their hierarchy was much better founded, and was confirmed by a surer testimony than that on which those who in the present day usurp the title of Church plume themselves. Those, therefore, who will have their definition of the visible Church to be received indiscriminately, and without exception, lay the faithful under the necessity of denying Christ, abandoning the truth of God, and oftentimes adhering to impiety.

Digitized by Google

Article XX. Of the Articles of Faith delivered by the Church.

It is certain that many things are to be believed which are not expressly and specially delivered in the sacred Scriptures, but which are necessarily to be received from the Church by tradition.

Proof.—From the inconvenience or absurdity of holding otherwise. For without this it would almost be necessary to make the world anew: since not a hundredth part of those things which we firmly hold, and which are received amongst us, without any doubt, can be proved expressly from the Scriptures, but being elicited, after a long process, by the subtle deductions of the Doctors, maintain their certainty. It is proved, also, from probability. For it must be believed, that though the apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit, and had a command to instruct the Church perfectly, they were yet willing to leave something to their successors, that they might not, by anticipating them in all things, clip their wings too much. It is proved, likewise, from analogy. For, as in jurisprudence, there is a law written, and a law unwritten, so ought there to be in theology.

Antidote to Article XX.

"God," says an apostle, (Heb. i. 1,) "who, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things." But what kind of expectation the Israelitish people had of the doctrine of Christ, appears from the expression of the woman of Samaria, "When the Messiah is come, he will tell us all things," (John iv. 25.) We ought, therefore, to stand fast in the doctrine in which we know that all the fulness of heavenly wisdom is included. On this very ground does Augustine decide, that nothing not delivered in the Scriptures is necessary to salvation, (Lib. ii. *De Pecc. Mer. et Remiss. cap. ult.*) For, if it were necessary to be known, God would not have omitted it. There is also a

Digitized by Google

remarkable sentence of Chrysostom, (*De Sanct. et Ador. in Spiritu,*) "As Christ declares that he spoke not of himself, because he spoke from the law and the prophets; so, if any thing beside the gospel is obtruded upon us under the name of the Spirit, let us not believe it. For as Christ is the fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets, so is the Spirit the fulfilment of the Gospel." On the whole, since the certainty of faith should be sought from none but God only, we conclude that true faith is founded only on the Scriptures which proceeded from him, since therein he has been pleased to teach not partially, but fully, whatever he wished us to know, and knew to be useful.

ARTICLE XXI. OF THE POWER OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

With the same full conviction of its truth ought it to be received, that the power of excommunicating is immediately and of divine right granted to the Church of Christ, and that, on that account, ecclesiastical censures are to be greatly feared.

There are many minute questions among the Doctors, Whether, in exercising the power of excommunication, the key of knowledge and discernment is required? But do you say expressly—it being fixed that the Church cannot err, this power is plenary? This, too, seems to have been the meaning of our masters, who speak thus without drawing any distinction. But if it is asked, Whether he who has been excommunicated unjustly, has been excommunicated by the power of Christ? say it is enough that it is in his name.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XXI.

As the power of excommunicating has been committed to the Church, so the due mode of using it has been prescribed. First, Let judgment be given only from the mouth of the Lord, (Matth. ii. 7.) Secondly, Let edification be studied, not destruction, (2 Cor. x. 8.) If it is done otherwise, the well-known sentiment of Gregory applies, "He who abuses the power committed to him deserves to lose his privilege." But we speak of the external form of the

Digitized by Google

Church. For the true Church, as it is governed by the Spirit of Christ, will never, in judging, recede from the rule of his word. But, as it often happens, that those who are invested with ordinary power in the Church exercise tyranny instead of legitimate judgment, this distinction is to be carefully observed. Otherwise, Christ would in vain say to the apostles, "They will cast you out of their synagogues." We need not fear, therefore, at being excommunicated from any society from which God and his truth are exiled. But we ought not only to fear, but to guard with special care, against being excommunicated from that Church which has for its bond of unity the pure doctrine of God; for there is no salvation out of her communion, (Is. ii. 3; Joel ii. 32; Ezek. xiii. 9.)

Article XXII. Of the Authority of Councils.

It is certain that a General Council, lawfully convened, representing the whole Church, cannot err in its determination of faith and practice.

Proof.—A General Council, always, and without exception, represents the Church, which otherwise would not be visible. But remember, it must be a Council in which the Pope presides. For though, in the Council of Nice, the legates of Saint Sylvester had not the first place, but the fourth, that was owing to the rudeness of the times—the Church not being fully constituted. But if any one objects the Council of Basle, say that it ought not to have any authority, as Eugenius had recalled his mandate, and withdrawn from the Cardinal of the Holy Cross his right to preside. But when our masters speak of a lawful assembly, it is to be observed, that for the lawfully assembling of a Council, it is sufficient that the legal forms and solemnities be duly observed. For should any one begin to dispute whether or not the prelates who sit there have a right intention, and whether or not they are learned, and whether or not they have a knowledge of sacred literature, and whether or

Digitized by Google

not they are disposed to obey sound doctrine, the process would be endless.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XXII.

Christ promises that he will be in the midst of those who are assembled, provided it be in his name, (Matth. xviii. 20.) Therefore, faith is not to be placed in all kinds of councils indifferently, but in such only as shall appear to have been assembled in the name of Christ. The prophets exclaim, "From the prophet even unto the priest every one dealeth falsely," (Jer. vi. 13.) Again, "His watchmen are blind; they are all ignorant," (Is. lvi. 10.) Again, "There is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst thereof." "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things," (Ezek. xxii. 25, 26.) Since the Israelitish Church, which was the true Church of God, was liable to this misfortune, why should not the same thing happen to us? Nay, the apostles even announced that it would be so. "But there were false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you," (2 Pet. ii. 1.) Our conclusion then is, that a council, that has been assembled in the name of Christ, is governed by the Holy Spirit, and is under his guidance led into truth. But those councils over which Christ does not preside are governed by their own sense, and so can do nothing but err, and lead into error. We maintain, moreover, that in some councils, though guided at the outset by the Spirit of God, the will of the flesh creeps in and turns them aside from the truth. For it is in Christ alone that the fulness of the Spirit dwells, and to each man grace is given in measure, (John i. 16; 1 Cor. xii. 5, 27; Eph. iv. 7.)

ARTICLE XXIII. OF THE PRIMACY OF THE ROMAN SEE.

Nor is it less certain that in the Church militant there is, by divine right, a Supreme Pontiff whom all Christians are bound to obey, and who, indeed, has the power of granting indulgences.

PROOF.—It was said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," &c. But when the Lutherans say that Peter is

Digitized by Google

there praised as one among the number of the faithful, and that the Rock, which ought to be the foundation of the Church, is Christ, since Peter, in as much as he denied Christ, would not have been a good foundation, and, according to Paul, no other foundation can any man lay than that which is laid, viz., Christ, never yield this to them. For, seeing there is a different interpretation in favour of the Roman see, the well known rule of law is, that favours ought to be liberally interpreted.

The Lutherans have also another answer, viz., that, supposing Christ gave the primacy to Peter, it does not follow that he gave it to his successors, unless, indeed, they are all to be also called Satans, it having been said to Peter, "Get behind me, Satan." Their argument is, that those who succeed to the one title succeed equally to the other. But answer, that, by the rule of law, odious terms are to be strictly interpreted. Or, give another explanation, viz., that in the first instance Christ spoke to Peter as a future or incipient Pope, in the second spoke to him as a private individual.

They argue besides in this way; why did Peter confer the inheritance of the primacy on the Roman see rather than on that of Antioch, since he was bishop in both? Answer, that the place acquires dignity from his having died in it, especially from its being the place where the blood of martyrs, which is dear in the sight of the Lord, was shed, according to the Antiphone which is sung on his festival. They also object, why did not James and John acquire for the Churches in which they presided the second and third degree of primacy and dignity, in the same way as Peter acquired the first at Rome, since Paul says that those three were considered pillars? To this answer, that if others were not sufficiently zealous or magnanimous in maintaining their right, it does not follow that this ought to prejudice Rome. Therefore, Jerusalem and Ephesus, on account of their negligence or false shame, were deservedly put into the back-ground. But Rome, which stood stoutly up for her honour, deserved to remain first.

Digitized by Google

They also use ridicule, saying, that if Rome ought to be the prime see, because Peter preached and died there, for the same reason the desert ought to have been the prime see to the ancient people, for there Moses, the prince of the prophets, both preached and died; likewise Aaron, the first high priest, there exercised his office until death. Nay, they maintain, that Jerusalem ought rather to take precedence of Rome and all other cities, for there our Lord fulfilled his ministry, and there died. But answer, that under the old dispensation, the succession to the priesthood was a personal, but is now a real right, and goes with the place. As to Christ, solve the difficulty thus: That he did not choose to found a primacy in his own person, for he himself says, I came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Still, however, they object, that even if there had been a primacy at Rome, it could endure only so long as the Church remained there, and as long as the Pope was a bishop. But they deny that there now is a Church there, because there is the greatest confusion, and they deny that the Pope is a bishop, because he does nothing episcopal. But tell them that this objection is not to be admitted, because the thing is impossible; for it is written, "I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not."

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XXIII.

Scripture often mentions Christ the universal Head, but no where mentions the Pope. And when Paul pourtrays the Church, he does not make it the universal bishopric of one, but says that Christ governs the Church by his ministers. And yet the passage especially required that one should be named as over the others, if that were the fact, (Eph. i. 22; iv. 15; v. 23; Col. i. 18; ii. 20.) In commendation of unity, he mentions one Lord, one faith, one baptism, (Eph. iv. 11.) Why does he not add one Pope, the ministerial head? Moreover, the hierarchy, which, as the flatterers of the Pope pretend, consists chiefly in the primacy of the Roman see, is there professedly described. Why, then, does he omit what would have been most appropriate to the subject? He elsewhere says, (Gal. ii. 8,)

Digitized by Google

that his office of apostle towards the Gentiles was equal to that which Peter received towards the Jews. Whence we infer two things—that Peter was not his head, and that the apostleship of Peter does not properly extend to us. He there also relates that he had entered into fellowship with Peter, but not to acknowledge him as superior. And Peter himself, when he writes to pastors, does not command with authority, but makes them his colleagues, and exhorts them in an affable manner, as is usual among equals, (1 Pet. i. 5.) When he is accused of having gone in to the Gentiles, though this accusation was unfounded, yet by clearing himself before the Church, he professes subjection, (Acts xi. 4.) And being justly reprimanded by Paul, he does not claim exemption, but obediently suffers himself to be corrected. Being ordered by his colleagues to go to Samaria with John, he obeys the order.

Let us, therefore, hold fast what Paul says, (Eph. iv. 15,) that Christ is the head, "from whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." For he there places all men, without a single exception, in the body, and leaves the name and honour of head to Christ alone. Besides, to each of the members he attributes a certain measure and a definite and limited function, in order that the supreme power of government may reside with Christ alone.

Cyprian, too, when he describes the unity of the Church, says, (*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, cap. ii.[1]) "There is one bishopric, a

[1] "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ecclesia quoque una est, quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fœcunditatis extenditur. Quomodo solis multi radii, sed lumen unum; et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum; et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiæ largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine. Avelle radium solis a corpore, divisionem lucis unitas non capit. Ab arbore frange ramum, fractus germinare non poterit. A fronte præcide rivum, præcisus arescit. Sic et ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit. Unum tamen lumen est, quod ubique diffunditur, nec unitas corporis separatur.

Digitized by Google

part of which is held as a whole by each bishop, just as there are many rays, yet one light, and many branches in a tree, yet only one trunk fixed by its root; and as several streams flow from one fountain, and being more than one seem divided, yet notwithstanding of the apparent numerical diffusion through the copiousness of the discharge, unity is preserved entire in the source; so also the Church, pervaded with the light of the Lord, sends its rays over the whole world, yet it is but one light which is everywhere diffused; it extends its branches, it pours out its refluent streams over the entire globe; still there is but one head, and one original."

We see how he makes the bishopric of Christ alone universal, and teaches that portions of it are held by his ministers. For this reason it was forbidden by the Council of Carthage, (cap. 47,) to give to any one the name of chief of the priests, or prime bishop, or more than bishop of the prime see. And Gregory execrates the name of universal bishop as profane, nay, blasphemous, and the forerunner of antichrist, terming it an invention of the devil, (*Epist.* 76, *ad Maur.*, *Augustin. Epist.* 78, *ad Const.*, *Augustin. sequenti ad Euodium.*) Cyprian does not honour the Roman bishop with any other appellation than that of brother and co-bishop and colleague. In writing to Stephen, the Roman bishop, he not only makes him the equal of himself and others, but even addresses him in harsher terms, accusing him of arrogance and ignorance. Nay, even Jerome, a Roman presbyter, hesitates not to make that see subordinate. If, says he, (*Epist. ad Anien.*) the question of authority is raised, the world is greater than a city. Why talk to me of the custom of one city? Why, against the laws of the Church, vindicate the few, from whom superciliousness has sprung? Wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or

Ramos suos in universam terram copia ubertatis extendit, profluentes largiter rivos latius expandit. Unum tamen caput est, et origo una, et una mater fœcunditatis successibus copiosa."—*De Unitate Ecclesiæ*, cap. ii.

The passage in Calvin's text is abridged, and, of course, is also abridged in the translation.

Digitized by Google

Constantinople, or Rhegium, there is the same merit, and the same priesthood. The power of riches, and the humbleness of poverty, do not make one bishop superior, and another inferior. Lastly, were every thing else conceded to the Romans, he cannot be the chief of the bishops who is no bishop at all.

Article XXIV. Of Human Constitutions.

Ecclesiastical constitutions, such as those concerning fasting, the choice of food, abstinence from flesh, and many others, truly oblige in the forum of conscience, even to the exclusion of all offence.

Proof First, from similitude, or from example. For the Rabbins of the Jews also say that the precepts of the wise ought to be observed as the laws of God are, and this without doubt. Proof Second, from reason. For the Church is the substitute of Christ, and represents his person; therefore, it should be able to do as much as Christ can. Proof Third, from authority, because it is said, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; and whatever things they say unto you do." But when the Lutherans reply, that this is said of the law which the Pharisees taught when they were in that seat, and adduce, in confirmation, the order elsewhere given us to beware of their leaven, that is, their doctrine, and also the exposition of Augustine, where he asks, What else does the Lord mean than that they hear the voice of the pastor through the medium of hirelings? For sitting in the chair, they teach the law of the Lord; therefore, God teaches by them. But if they choose to teach what is their own, refuse to hear, refuse to do: To all this answer, that it is impossible that the Church can teach any thing else than the will of God, because it is directed by the Holy Spirit. There is also another proof from authority. For it is said, "Obey those who are set over you." But when the Lutherans say that this ought to be restricted conformably to the rule which Peter lays down to those who have rule, viz., not to exercise dominion over the heritage; and also, to

Digitized by Google

the rule which Paul says that he observed among the Corinthians, not lording it over their faith, there is nothing in the objection. For, even if those who preside issue improper orders, still those under them are bound to obey. Then, we ought always to return to the principle—Because they are the Church, they cannot err in determinations of practice. Finally, there is a proof from utility. For it is scandalous to make great changes. And Solomon forbids us to remove the ancient landmarks which our fathers placed. But the greater part of the observances by which the world is governed in the present day are traditions of the Church, and, therefore, it would neither be convenient nor useful to cause so much confusion by changing every thing. Add, that they contribute to decency and comeliness of conduct. If any one say that they do not by this bind consciences, I answer, that this is done accidentally, in consequence of their ratification. For the Church intended this, and the people consented.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XXIV.

"There is one Lawgiver," says James, (iv. 12,) "who can save and destroy." And the reason for this is twofold; because the will of God is to us a perfect rule of righteousness and holiness, and he alone possesses authority over souls—an authority which he resigns to none. Therefore, the Lord everywhere urges obedience, and obedience to himself alone. Hence those expressions, "Obedience is better than sacrifice," (1 Sam. xv. 22.) Likewise, "Whatever I command you, that observe and do. You will not add ought or diminish." Likewise, "Let not every one do what seemeth to him good, but do only what I command you." Likewise, "Did I ever command your fathers to offer sacrifices to me?" and not this rather, "Hearing, hear my voice," (1 Sam. xv. 22; Deut. xii. 8, 32; iv. 2; Jer. vii. 22.) Paul declares it unlawful to bind the conscience by any human laws. "Stand fast," says he, (Gal. v. 1,) "in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not again entangled with the yoke of bondage." He elsewhere gives the reason, (Col. ii. 23.) For even those things which have

Digitized by Google

a show of wisdom are frivolous and vain, if they are according to the precepts and traditions of men. In like manner, he declares, when he treats of marriage, that he is unwilling to lay a snare for believers, (1 Cor. v. 35.) Therefore, the spiritual kingdom of Christ is violated, and his authority over souls infringed, when men usurp the right of binding consciences by their own laws. Besides, it is abomination in the sight of God to frame to him a worship which he does not require, or to embrace one devised by man without the sanction of his word, as Isaiah testifies, (Is. xxix. 13,) when for this cause he denounces dreadful judgments from God upon the people, because they worshipped him with the commandments of men. And we have the well-known declaration of Christ, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," (Matth. xv. 9.)

As to the choice of meats, we have the doctrine of Paul, "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink," (Col. ii. 16.) Also, "The kingdom of Christ is not meat and drink," (Rom. xiv. 17.) We have also the declaration of Christ, "That which entereth into the mouth defileth not the man," (Matth. xv. 11.) And in another passage Paul, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, predicts that impostors would arise, prohibiting the use of meats, which God had created, and also of holy matrimony, (1 Tim. iv. 3.) It is impossible to listen to the quibble, that, in the former passages, Paul is disputing with the Jews, and that this prophecy is directed against the Tatians and their followers. For if God has abolished the distinction of meats which he had introduced into the law, and has subjected all meats indifferently to the power of men, who can now assume to himself the right of making new laws, by which the liberty allowed by God is taken away? If Augustine, even in his day, justly complained that the Church, which God in his mercy wished to be free, was so burdened, that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable, in what terms shall we deplore the bondage which now exists?

Digitized by Google

Article XXV. Of Vows, and their Obligation.

In the same forum of conscience, vows are obligatory, although they be monastic, such as perpetual continence, poverty, and obedience.

Proved, First, by the true stanza, "Words bind men, ropes the horns of bulls." For, (arguing from the less to the greater,) if we keep our promises to men, how much more to God? But when the Lutherans object that a contract is not completed without the consent of both parties; also, that pactions against law are not valid: answer, that whatever is done with a good intention is pleasing to God. And if any one vows with a bad intention, yet, on account of the honour due to vows, it is the same as if he had vowed with a good intention. This holds especially in the monastic vow on account of the dignity of the profession, because, as St Thomas says, it is like a second baptism.

When, in regard to perpetual continence, the Lutherans adduce another argument, viz., that no man is bound to observe it, unless it be given him from above: answer, that, according to the Doctors, a vow does not cease to be obligatory, because the faculty of performance is defective. But they ask, Which of the two is better for a monk or a priest—to marry, or to commit fornication? And, moreover, they produce the authority of Cyprian, who, in his eleventh Epistle, says of sacred virgins or nuns, that if they will not or cannot persevere, it is better for them to marry than to fall into the fire by indulgence. But a contrary reason prevails, according to the determination of the Canonists also, on account of the contumacy, and more direct infringement of the vow. It is proved, moreover, that vows are obligatory, from their being dispensed with and loosed. The Pope could not dispense with vows, were it not for the power of the keys, and hence it follows that they bind the conscience. The only remaining doubt arises from its being said by our masters, "although they be monastic," the expression seeming to imply, that monastic

Digitized by Google

vows are less obligatory than others. But, observe that this was set down on account of the difficulty of observance, a difficulty which, but for this curb, might tempt monks to draw back.

ANTIDOTE TO ARTICLE XXV.

In vows three things are to be attended to: First, Whether the thing vowed is in our power; Secondly, Whether the purpose of the vow is right; Thirdly, Whether what we vow is in itself pleasing to God. When these, or any one of these, is wanting, we conclude that vows are fruitless and of no avail. Moreover, Scripture tells us that perpetual continence is not in every man's power; for Christ declares, that all do not receive this word, (Matth. xix. 11.) And Paul, speaking of this very gift, and so giving us to understand that it is a special gift not granted to all, reminds us, (1 Cor. vii. 7,) that the gifts of God are distributed. And, therefore, he enjoins all who burn to seek their remedy in marriage. "Whosoever," says he, "cannot contain, let him marry. Likewise, to avoid fornication, let every one have his own wife." But that in vowing monastical obedience, the end is vicious, is plain from a single expression of Paul, in which he condemns all ἐθελοθρησκειας, that is, voluntary modes of worship which men institute at their own hand. For this is the term which he uses in the Epistle to the Colossians, and which the translator has rendered by *superstition*. But when monks thus vow obedience to their superiors, they just worship God by human fictions. We maintain that the poverty which they vow is not only not acceptable to God, but is utterly displeasing to Him. For God orders every man to live by his own labour; and Paul says, (2 Thess. iii. 10,) "He who does not work should not eat." And he calls it a disorderly life for any man to live in idleness by another's sweat, commanding that such be excommunicated. Then the voluntary poverty which God recommends to us is, that he who is rich should, by bestowing his goods to relieve the wants of the brethren, make himself poor after the example of Christ. So Paul tells us, (2 Cor. viii. 9.) But the poverty which the monks profess is one by which, though idle, they

Digitized by Google

never hunger, but devour the goods of the poor, and deprive themselves of the power of well-doing. On the whole, we conclude, First, That vows conceived by superstition are of no value, and have no power to bind the conscience; Secondly, That vows rashly made from a foolish confidence in the flesh, ought to be speedily renounced, before God punishes their obstinate arrogance.

The New Statutes of the Faculty.

The Faculty of Theology prohibits the Masters of Arts and Bachelors of their own body and others, desirous, now or in future, to take a theological degree, from maintaining, on any account, in sermons or lectures, or from otherwise teaching counter to the above mentioned articles. On the contrary, when the subject and opportunity offer, they must announce them sincerely, and declare them openly to the people. Moreover, the Faculty has decreed that each Master and Bachelor shall confirm them by his subscription. And since it is not safe to nourish the disorderly and contentious, like wolves in the flock, the Faculty has resolved that all who shall refuse to obey this decree, or who shall teach, or in future preach, propositions contrary to those aforesaid, shall be expelled for ever from their body. But as, from a love of contradiction, and of departure from the customs of our ancestors, very many, studious of change and novelties in doctrine, neglect the laudable custom of imploring the grace of the Holy Spirit through the intercession of the blessed Virgin, we warn them not to be so averse to the angelical salutation which the gospel has prescribed to us, nor, as many are wont, when the name of the Lord our Saviour occurs, preposterously to disdain to use the name of Jesus, contenting themselves with calling him the Christ, (le Christ,) *especially seeing that, as Peter testifies, there is no other name given under heaven among men by which we can be saved. In like manner, when mention is incidentally made of the divine apostles and prophets, and holy doctors, let them not, as they are wont, designate them, without any title of honour, Paul, James, Matthew, Peter,*

Digitized by Google

Jerome, Augustine, nor consider it a grievance to prefix the word saint, calling them Saint Peter, Saint Paul, &c. And, lastly, let them not neglect to commend the souls of the dead to the prayers of the people.

10*th March, Anno Domini* 1542.

The Faculty of Theology, convened on oath in the College of Sorbonne, to consider the preceding Articles, approved of said Articles in the form in which they are written.

Signed by order of his Lordship the Dean, and of the Faculty.

FOURNIER CUM PARAPHO.

ANTIDOTE TO THE NEW STATUTES.

Isaiah prohibits all the disciples of God from saying, "conspiracy," as often as the multitude have conspired, (Isa. viii. 12.) By this he intimates that we are not to obey or consent to any counsels of the wicked. Let us, therefore, follow what he afterwards enjoins, *i.e.*, let us sanctify the Lord of Hosts, adhering to him with fear, that he may be our sanctification. Whosoever tempts us to withdraw from this fear, let him be to us anathema. And, like the blind man who received sight, let us not be afraid of being expelled from the synagogue of the wicked, since Christ will meet with us, and receive us into the fellowship of his body. It were better to die a hundred times, than to pollute our hands with a nefarious subscription abjuring the truth of God. For the Sorbonnists, who so often make mention of their herd, (*gregis,*) have here proved, that they are a herd of swine. That invocation of the Virgin, which they have hitherto used in seeking the grace of the Spirit, who sees not to be execrable blasphemy? to say nothing of those titles full of anathema, by which, while they would honour the Virgin, they most grievously insult her, calling her "the Queen of Heaven, and Treasury of Grace." We hear how Christ tells us, that he will send the Spirit of truth from the Father, and bids us ask in his own name, (John xiv. 26; xv. 26.) This, therefore, is the right rule of asking, and the sure method of obtaining. But to flee to the Virgin, passing

Digitized by Google

by Christ, and in prayer to address her instead of God, who sees not to be a profane practice? It is assuredly altogether alien from the Word of God. Nay, there is extant a Canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, forbidding the invocation of saints at the altar. Here, also, they (the Sorbonne) give a still clearer manifestation of their absurdity, when they say that this salutation is prescribed to us by the gospel. It is true, Gabriel was sent, as Luke relates, to salute the Virgin in these terms; but are we Gabriel? When was this ever commanded to us? What access have we to the Virgin, for the purpose of holding conference with her? Besides, why use the salutation at the time when they implore the influence of the Spirit, unless to pervert it into a form of prayer?

As to the name of Christ, how can ears so assinine be so delicate, as to be offended at modes of expression which the Holy Spirit employs? The name of Christ occurs everywhere in the Scriptures. All the writers of the Church used it; but it is not relished by our masters. And that they may not want a pretext, they bring forward that magical device of the Jews, as if the salvation of the Church were included in two syllables. Since they rave so absurdly about the name of Christ, it is not strange that they are so fastidious as to the names of saints.

But by what reason, or what example, do they impose it as a law upon preachers to commend the souls of the dead to the people? Many homilies of the ancients are extant, and from them it will be seen that nothing of the kind was ever done in the ancient Church. Accordingly, we see that they take the usual course of tyrants. When unable any longer to support their domination by moderate measures, they have recourse to truculence and barbarian ferocity. But what, on the other hand, does the Lord declare, "Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand," (Isa. viii. 10.) For "there is no wisdom, nor understanding, nor counsel, against the Lord," (Prov. xxi. 30.)

Digitized by Google

THE

NECESSITY OF REFORMING THE CHURCH,

PRESENTED TO

THE IMPERIAL DIET AT SPIRES, A.D. 1544,

IN THE NAME OF ALL WHO WISH CHRIST TO REIGN.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

NECESSITY OF REFORMING THE CHURCH.

TO THE MOST INVINCIBLE EMPEROR CHARLES V.,
AND THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS PRINCES AND OTHER ORDERS, NOW HOLDING
A DIET OF THE EMPIRE AT SPIRES,

A HUMBLE EXHORTATION

SERIOUSLY TO UNDERTAKE THE TASK OF RESTORING
THE CHURCH.

PRESENTED IN THE NAME OF ALL THOSE WHO WISH CHRIST TO REIGN.

AUGUST EMPEROR,

You have summoned this Diet, that, in concert with the Most Illustrious Princes and other Orders of the Empire, you may at length deliberate and decide upon the means of ameliorating the present condition of the Church, which we all see to be very miserable, and almost desperate. Now, therefore, while you are seated at this consultation, I humbly beg and implore, first of your Imperial Majesty, and at the same time of you also, Most Illustrious Princes, and distinguished Personages, that you will not decline to read, and diligently ponder, what I have to lay before you. The magnitude and weightiness of the cause may well excite in you an eagerness to hear, and I will set the matter so plainly in your view, that you can have no difficulty in determining

Digitized by Google

what course to adopt. Whoever I am, I here profess to plead in defence, both of sound doctrine and of the Church. In this character I seem at all events entitled to expect that you will not deny me audience until such time as it may appear whether I falsely usurp the character, or whether I faithfully perform its duties, and make good what I profess. But though I feel that I am by no means equal to so great a task, I am not at all afraid, that after you have heard the nature of my office, I shall be accused either of folly or presumption in having ventured thus to appear before you. There are two circumstances by which men are wont to recommend, or at least to justify, their conduct. If a thing is done honestly, and from pious zeal, we deem it worthy of praise; if it is done under the pressure of public necessity, we at least deem it not unworthy of excuse. Since both of these apply here, I am confident, from your equity, that I shall easily obtain your approval of my design. For where can I exert myself to better purpose or more honestly, where, too, in a matter at this time more necessary, than in attempting, according to my ability, to aid the Church of Christ, whose claims it is unlawful in any instance to deny, and which is now in grievous distress, and in extreme danger? But there is no occasion for a long preface concerning myself. Receive what I say as you would do if it were pronounced by the united voice of all those who either have already taken care to restore the Church, or are desirous that it should be restored to true order. In this situation are several Princes, of not the humblest class, and not a few distinguished communities. For all these I speak, though as an individual, yet so that it is more truly they who at once, and with one mouth, speak through me. To these add the countless multitude of pious men, who, scattered over the various regions of the Christian world, still unanimously concur with me in this pleading. In short, regard this as the common address of all who so earnestly deplore the present corruption of the Church, that they are unable to bear it longer, and are determined not to rest till they see some amendment. I am aware of the odious names with which

Digitized by Google

we are branded; but, meanwhile, whatever be the name by which it is thought proper to designate us, hear our cause, and, after you have heard, judge what the place is which we are entitled to hold.

First, then, the question is not, Whether the Church labours under diseases both numerous and grievous, (this is admitted even by all moderate judges,) but whether the diseases are of a kind the cure of which admits not of longer delay, and as to which, therefore, it is neither useful nor becoming to await the result of slow remedies. We are accused of rash and impious innovation, for having ventured to propose any change at all on the former state of the Church. What! Even if it has not been done either without cause or imperfectly? I hear there are persons who, even in this case, do not hesitate to condemn us; their opinion being, that we were indeed right in desiring amendment, but not right in attempting it. From such persons, all I would ask at present is, that they will for a little suspend their judgment until I shall have shown from fact that we have not been prematurely hasty—have not attempted any thing rashly, any thing alien from our duty—have, in fine, done nothing until compelled by the highest necessity. To enable me to prove this, it is necessary to attend to the matters in dispute.

We maintain, then, that at the commencement, when God raised up Luther and others, who held forth a torch to light us into the way of salvation, and who, by their ministry, founded and reared our churches, those heads of doctrine in which the truth of our religion, those in which the pure and legitimate worship of God, and those in which the salvation of men are comprehended, were in a great measure obsolete. We maintain that the use of the sacraments was in many ways vitiated and polluted. And we maintain that the government of the Church was converted into a species of foul and insufferable tyranny. But, perhaps these averments have not force enough to move certain individuals until they are better explained. This, therefore, I will do, not as the subject demands, but as far as my ability will permit. Here,

Digitized by Google

however, I have no intention to review and discuss all our controversies; that would require a long discourse, and this is not the place for it. I wish only to show how just and necessary the causes were which forced us to the changes for which we are blamed. To accomplish this, I must take up together the three following points.

First, I must briefly enumerate the evils which compelled us to seek for remedies.

Secondly, I must show that the particular remedies which our Reformers employed were apt and salutary.

Thirdly, I must make it plain that we were not at liberty any longer to delay putting forth our hand, in as much as the matter demanded instant amendment.

The first point, as I merely advert to it for the purpose of clearing my way to the other two, I will endeavour to dispose of in a few words, but in wiping off the heavy charge of sacrilegious audacity and sedition, founded on the allegation, that we have improperly, and with intemperate haste, usurped an office which did not belong to us, I will dwell at greater length.

If it be inquired, then, by what things chiefly the Christian religion has a standing existence amongst us, and maintains its truth, it will be found that the following two not only occupy the principal place, but comprehend under them all the other parts, and consequently the whole substance of Christianity, viz., a knowledge, *first*, of the mode in which God is duly worshipped; and, *secondly*, of the source from which salvation is to be obtained. When these are kept out of view, though we may glory in the name of Christians, our profession is empty and vain. After these come the Sacraments and the Government of the Church, which, as they were instituted for the preservation of these branches of doctrine, ought not to be employed for any other purpose; and, indeed, the only means of ascertaining whether they are administered purely and in due form, or otherwise, is to bring them to this test. If any one is desirous of a clearer and more familiar illustration, I would say, that rule in the Church, the pastoral office, and all other matters of order,

Digitized by Google

resemble the body, whereas the doctrine which regulates the due worship of God, and points out the ground on which the consciences of men must rest their hope of salvation, is the soul which animates the body, renders it lively and active, and, in short, makes it not to be a dead and useless carcase.

As to what I have yet said, there is no controversy among the pious, or among men of right and sane mind.

Let us now see what is meant by the due worship of God. Its chief foundation is to acknowledge Him to be, as He is, the only source of all virtue, justice, holiness, wisdom, truth, power, goodness, mercy, life, and salvation; in accordance with this, to ascribe and render to Him the glory of all that is good, to seek all things in Him alone, and in every want have recourse to Him alone. Hence arises prayer, hence praise and thanksgiving—these being attestations to the glory which we attribute to Him. This is that genuine sanctification of His name which He requires of us above all things. To this is united adoration, by which we manifest for Him the reverence due to his greatness and excellency, and to this ceremonies are subservient, as helps or instruments, in order that, in the performance of divine worship, the body may be exercised at the same time with the soul. Next after these comes self-abasement, when, renouncing the world and the flesh, we are transformed in the renewing of our mind, and living no longer to ourselves, submit to be ruled and actuated by Him. By this self-abasement we are trained to obedience and devotedness to his will, so that his fear reigns in our hearts, and regulates all the actions of our lives. That in these things consists the true and sincere worship which alone God approves, and in which alone He delights, is both taught by the Holy Spirit throughout the Scriptures, and is also, antecedent to discussion, the obvious dictate of piety. Nor from the beginning was there any other method of worshipping God, the only difference being, that this spiritual truth, which with us is naked and simple, was under the former dispensation wrapt up in figures. And this is the meaning of our Saviour's words, "The hour cometh, and now

Digitized by Google

is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth," (John iv. 23.) For by these words he meant not to declare that God was not worshipped by the fathers in this spiritual manner, but only to point out a distinction in the external form, viz., That while they had the Spirit shadowed forth by many figures, we have it in simplicity. But it has always been an acknowledged point, that God, who is a Spirit, must be worshipped in spirit and in truth.

Moreover, the rule which distinguishes between pure and vitiated worship is of universal application, in order that we may not adopt any device which seems fit to ourselves, but look to the injunctions of Him who alone is entitled to prescribe. Therefore, if we would have Him to approve our worship, this rule, which he everywhere enforces with the utmost strictness, must be carefully observed. For there is a twofold reason why the Lord, in condemning and prohibiting all fictitious worship, requires us to give obedience only to his own voice. First, it tends greatly to establish His authority that we do not follow our own pleasure, but depend entirely on his sovereignty; and, secondly, such is our folly, that when we are left at liberty, all we are able to do is to go astray. And then when once we have turned aside from the right path, there is no end to our wanderings, until we get buried under a multitude of superstitions. Justly, therefore, does the Lord, in order to assert his full right of dominion, strictly enjoin what he wishes us to do, and at once reject all human devices which are at variance with his command. Justly, too, does he, in express terms, define our limits, that we may not, by fabricating perverse modes of worship, provoke His anger against us.

I know how difficult it is to persuade the world that God disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by His Word. The opposite persuasion which cleaves to them, being seated, as it were, in their very bones and marrow, is, that whatever they do has in itself a sufficient sanction, provided it exhibits some kind of zeal for the honour of God. But since God not only regards as fruit-

Digitized by Google

less, but also plainly abominates, whatever we undertake from zeal to His worship, if at variance with His command, what do we gain by a contrary course? The words of God are clear and distinct, "Obedience is better than sacrifice." "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," (1 Sam. xv. 22; Matth. xv. 9.) Every addition to His word, especially in this matter, is a lie. Mere "will worship" (ἐθελοθρησκεία) is vanity. This is the decision, and when once the judge has decided, it is no longer time to debate.

Will your Imperial Majesty now be pleased to recognise, and will you, Most Illustrious Princes, lend me your attention, while I show how utterly at variance with this view are all the observances, in which, throughout the Christian world in the present day, divine worship is made to consist? In word, indeed, they concede to God the glory of all that is good, but, in reality, they rob him of the half, or more than the half, by partitioning his perfections among the saints. Let our adversaries use what evasions they may, and defame us for exaggerating what they pretend to be trivial errors, I will simply state the fact as every man perceives it. Divine offices are distributed among the saints as if they had been appointed colleagues to the Supreme God, and, in a multitude of instances, they are made to do his work, while He is kept out of view. The thing I complain of is just what every body confesses by a vulgar proverb. For what is meant by saying, "the Lord cannot be known for apostles," unless it be that, by the height to which apostles are raised, the dignity of Christ is sunk, or at least obscured? The consequence of this perversity is, that mankind, forsaking the fountain of living waters, have learned, as Jeremiah tells us, to hew them out "cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water," (Jer. ii. 13.) For where is it that they seek for salvation and every other good? Is it in God alone? The whole tenor of their lives openly proclaims the contrary. They say, indeed, that they seek salvation and every other good in Him; but it is mere pretence, seeing they seek them elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

Of this fact, we have clear proof in the corruptions by which prayer was first vitiated, and afterwards in a great measure perverted and extinguished. We have observed, that prayer affords a test whether or not suppliants render due glory to God. In like manner, will it enable us to discover whether, after robbing Him of his glory, they transfer it to the creatures. In genuine prayer, something more is required than mere entreaty. The suppliant must feel assured that God is the only being to whom he ought to flee, both because He only can succour him in necessity; and also, because He has engaged to do it. But no man can have this conviction unless he pays regard both to the command by which God calls us to himself, and to the promise of listening to our prayers which is annexed to the command. The command was not thus regarded when the generality of mankind invoked angels and dead men promiscuously with God, and the wiser part, if they did not invoke them instead of God, at least regarded them as mediators, at whose intercession God granted their requests. Where, then, was the promise which is founded entirely on the intercession of Christ? Passing by Christ, the only Mediator, each betook himself to the patron who had struck his fancy, or if at any time a place was given to Christ, it was one in which he remained unnoticed, like some ordinary individual in a crowd. Then, although nothing is more repugnant to the nature of genuine prayer than doubt and distrust, so much did these prevail, that they were almost regarded as necessary, in order to pray aright. And why was this? Just because the world understood not the force of the expressions in which God invites us to pray to him, engages to do whatsoever we ask in reliance on his command and promise, and sets forth Christ as the Advocate in whose name our prayers are heard. Besides, let the public prayers which are in common use in Churches be examined. It will be found that they are stained with numberless impurities. From them, therefore, we have it in our power to judge how much this part of divine worship was vitiated. Nor was there less corruption in the expressions

Digitized by Google

of thanksgiving. To this fact, testimony is borne by the public hymns, in which the saints are lauded for every blessing, just as if they were the colleagues of God.

Then what shall I say of adoration? Do not men pay to images and statues the very same reverence which they pay to God? It is an error to suppose that there is any difference between this madness and that of the heathen. For God forbids us not only to worship images, but to regard them as the residence of his divinity, and worship it as residing in them. The very same pretexts which the patrons of this abomination employ in the present day, were formerly employed by the heathen to cloak their impiety. Besides, it is undeniable that saints, nay, their very bones, garments, shoes, and images, are adored even in the place of God. But some subtle disputant will object, that there are divers species of adoration,—that the honour of *dulia*, as they term it, is given to saints, their images, and their bones; and that *latria* is reserved for God as due to him only, unless we are to except *hyperdulia*, a species which, as the infatuation increased, was invented to set the blessed Virgin above the rest. As if these subtle distinctions were either known or present to the minds of those who prostrate themselves before images. Meanwhile, the world is full of idolatry not less gross, and if I may so speak, not less capable of being felt, than was the ancient idolatry of the Egyptians, which all the Prophets everywhere so strongly reprobate.

I am merely glancing at each of these corruptions, because I will afterwards more clearly expose their demerits.

I come now to ceremonies, which, while they ought to be grave attestations of divine worship, are rather a mere mockery of God. A new Judaism, as a substitute for that which God had distinctly abrogated, has again been reared up by means of numerous puerile extravagancies, collected from different quarters; and with these have been mixed up certain impious rites, partly borrowed from the heathen, and more adapted to some theatrical show than to the dignity of our religion. The first evil here is, that an immense

Digitized by Google

number of ceremonies, which God had by his authority abrogated, once for all, have been again revived. The next evil is, that while ceremonies ought to be living exercises of piety, men are vainly occupied with numbers of them that are both frivolous and useless. But by far the most deadly evil of all is, that after men have thus mocked God with ceremonies of one kind or other, they think they have fulfilled their duty as admirably as if these ceremonies included in them the whole essence of piety and divine worship.

With regard to self-abasement, on which depends regeneration to newness of life, the whole doctrine was entirely obliterated from the minds of men, or, at least, half buried, so that it was known to few, and to them but slenderly. But the spiritual sacrifice which the Lord in an especial manner recommends, is to mortify the old, and be transformed into a new man. It may be, perhaps, that preachers stammer out something about these words, but that they have no idea of the things meant by them is apparent even from this,—that they strenuously oppose us in our attempt to restore this branch of divine worship. If at any time they discourse on repentance, they only glance, as if in contempt, at the points of principal moment, and dwell entirely on certain external exercises of the body, which, as Paul assures us, are not of the highest utility, (Col. ii. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 8.) What makes this perverseness the more intolerable is, that the generality, under a pernicious error, pursue the shadow for the substance, and, overlooking true repentance, devote their whole attention to abstinences, vigils, and other things, which Paul terms "beggarly elements" of the world.

Having observed that the Word of God is the test which discriminates between his true worship and that which is false and vitiated, we thence readily infer that the whole form of divine worship in general use in the present day is nothing but mere corruption. For men pay no regard to what God has commanded, or to what he approves, in order that they may serve him in a becoming manner, but assume to themselves a licence of devising modes of worship, and

Digitized by Google

afterwards obtruding them upon him as a substitute for obedience. If in what I say I seem to exaggerate, let an examination be made of all the acts by which the generality suppose that they worship God. I dare scarcely except a tenth part as not the random offspring of their own brain. What more would we? God rejects, condemns, abominates all fictitious worship, and employs his Word as a bridle to keep us in unqualified obedience. When shaking off this yoke, we wander after our own fictions, and offer to him a worship, the work of human rashness, how much soever it may delight ourselves, in his sight it is vain trifling, nay, vileness and pollution. The advocates of human traditions paint them in fair and gaudy colours; and Paul certainly admits that they carry with them a show of wisdom; but as God values obedience more than all sacrifices, it ought to be sufficient for the rejection of any mode of worship, that it is not sanctioned by the command of God.

We come now to what we have set down as the second principal branch of Christian doctrine, viz., knowledge of the source from which salvation is to be obtained. Now, the knowledge of our salvation presents three different stages. First, we must begin with a sense of individual wretchedness, filling us with despondency as if we were spiritually dead. This effect is produced when the original and hereditary depravity of our nature is set before us as the source of all evil—a depravity which begets in us distrust, rebellion against God, pride, avarice, lust, and all kinds of evil concupiscence, and making us averse to all rectitude and justice, holds us captive under the yoke of sin; and when, moreover, each individual, on the disclosure of his own sins, feeling confounded at his turpitude, is forced to be dissatisfied with himself, and to account himself and all that he has of his own as less than nothing; then, on the other hand, conscience being cited to the bar of God, becomes sensible of the curse under which it lies, and, as if it had received a warning of eternal death, learns to tremble at the divine anger. This, I say, is the first stage in the way to salvation, when the sinner, over-

Digitized by Google

whelmed and prostrated, despairs of all carnal aid, yet does not harden himself against the justice of God, or become stupidly callous, but, trembling and anxious, groans in agony, and sighs for relief. From this he should rise to the second stage. This he does when, animated by the knowledge of Christ, he again begins to breathe. For to one humbled in the manner in which we have described, no other course remains but to turn to Christ, that through his interposition he may be delivered from misery. But the only man who thus seeks salvation in Christ is the man who is aware of the extent of his power; that is, acknowledges Him as the only Priest who reconciles us to the Father, and His death as the only sacrifice by which sin is expiated, the divine justice satisfied, and a true and perfect righteousness acquired; who, in fine, does not divide the work between himself and Christ, but acknowledges it to be by mere gratuitous favour that he is justified in the sight of God. From this stage also he must rise to the third, when instructed in the grace of Christ, and in the fruits of his death and resurrection, he rests in him with firm and solid confidence, feeling assured that Christ is so completely his own, that he possesses in him righteousness and life.

Now, see how sadly this doctrine has been perverted. On the subject of original sin, perplexing questions have been raised by the Schoolmen, who have done what they could to explain away this fatal disease; for in their discussions they reduce it to little more than excess of bodily appetite and lust. Of that blindness and vanity of intellect, whence unbelief and superstition proceed, of inward depravity of soul, of pride, ambition, stubbornness, and other secret sources of evil, they say not a word. And sermons are not a whit more sound. Then, as to the doctrine of free will, as preached before Luther and other Reformers appeared, what effect could it have but to fill men with an overweening opinion of their own virtue, swelling them out with vanity, and leaving no room for the grace and assistance of the Holy Spirit? But why dwell

Digitized by Google

on this? There is no point which is more keenly contested, none in which our adversaries are more inveterate in their opposition, than that of justification, namely, as to whether we obtain it by faith or by works. On no account will they allow us to give Christ the honour of being called our righteousness, unless their works come in at the same time for a share of the merit. The dispute is not, whether good works ought to be performed by the pious, and whether they are accepted by God and rewarded by him, but whether, by their own worth, they reconcile us to God; whether we acquire eternal life as their price, whether they are compensations which are made to the justice of God, so as to take away guilt, and whether they are to be confided in as a ground of salvation. We condemn the error which enjoins men to have more respect to their own works than to Christ, as a means of rendering God propitious, of meriting His favour, and obtaining the inheritance of eternal life; in short, as a means of becoming righteous in His sight. First, they plume themselves on the merit of works, as if they laid God under obligations to them. Pride such as this, what is it but a fatal intoxication of soul? For instead of Christ, they adore themselves, and dream of possessing life while they are immersed in the profound abyss of death. It may be said that I am exaggerating on this head, but no man can deny the trite doctrine of the schools and churches to be, that it is by works we must merit the favour of God, and by works acquire eternal life—that any hope of salvation unpropped by good works is rash and presumptuous—that we are reconciled to God by the satisfaction of good works, and not by a gratuitous remission of sins—that good works are meritorious of eternal salvation, not because they are freely imputed for righteousness through the merits of Christ, but in terms of law; and that men, as often as they lose the grace of God, are reconciled to Him, not by a free pardon, but by what they term works of satisfaction, these works being supplemented by the merits of Christ and martyrs, provided only the sinner deserves to be so assist-

Digitized by Google

ed. It is certain, that before Luther became known to the world, all men were fascinated by these impious dogmas; and even in the present day, there is no part of our doctrine which our opponents impugn with greater earnestness and obstinacy.

Lastly, there was another most pestilential error, which not only occupied the minds of men, but was regarded as one of the principal articles of faith, of which it was impious to doubt, viz., that believers ought to be perpetually in suspense and uncertainty as to their interest in the divine favour. By this suggestion of the devil, the power of faith was completely extinguished, the benefits of Christ's purchase destroyed, and the salvation of men overthrown. For, as Paul declares, that faith only is Christian faith which inspires our hearts with confidence, and emboldens us to appear in the presence of God, (Rom. v. 2.) On no other view could his doctrine in another passage be maintained, viz., that[1] "we have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father," (Rom. viii. 15.)

But what is the effect of that hesitancy which our enemies require in their disciples, save to annihilate all confidence in the promises of God? Paul argues, that "If they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect," (Rom. iv. 14.) Why so? Just because the law keeps a man in doubt, and does not permit him to entertain a sure and firm confidence. But they, on the other hand, dream of a faith, which, excluding and repelling man from that confidence which Paul requires, throws him back upon conjecture, to be tossed like a reed shaken by the wind. And it is not surprising that after they had once founded their hope of salvation on the merit of works, they plunged into all this absurdity. It could not but happen, that from such a precipice they should have

1 "Habere nos testimonium adoptionis nostræ intus à Spiritu Sancto obsignatum, quo freti Deum Patrem vocamus;" that we have the testimony of our adoption inwardly from the Holy Spirit, trusting to which, we call God our Father.

Digitized by Google

such a fall. For what can man find in his works but materials for doubt, and, finally, for despair? We thus see how error led to error.

Here, mighty Emperor, and most Illustrious Princes, it will be necessary to recall to your remembrance what I formerly observed, viz., that the safety of the Church depends as much on this doctrine as human life does on the soul. If the purity of this doctrine is in any degree impaired, the Church has received a deadly wound; and, therefore, when I shall have shown that it was for the greater part extinguished, it will be the same as if I had shown that the Church had been brought to the very brink of destruction. As yet, I have only alluded to this in passing, but by-and-by I will unfold it more clearly.

I come now to those things which I have likened to the body, viz., government and the dispensation of the sacraments, of which, when the doctrine is subverted, the power and utility are gone, although the external form should be faultless. What, then, if there was no soundness in them externally or internally? And it is not difficult to demonstrate that this was the fact. First, In regard to the sacraments, ceremonies devised by men were placed in the same rank with the mysteries instituted by Christ. For seven sacraments were received without any distinction, though Christ appointed two only, the others resting merely on human authority. Yet to these the grace of God was held to be annexed, just as much as if Christ had been present in them. Moreover, the two which Christ instituted were fearfully corrupted. Baptism was so disguised by superfluous additions, that scarcely a vestige of pure and genuine baptism could be traced; while the Holy Supper was not only corrupted by extraneous observances, but its very form was altogether changed. What Christ commanded to be done, and in what order, is perfectly clear. But in contempt of his command, a theatrical exhibition was got up, and substituted for the Supper. For what resemblance is there between the Mass and the true Supper of our Lord? While the command of Christ en-

Digitized by Google

joins believers to communicate with each other in the sacred symbols of his body and blood, the thing seen at Mass ought more properly to be termed excommunion. For the priest separates himself from the rest of the assembly, and devours apart that which ought to have been brought forward into the midst and distributed. Then, as if he were some successor of Aaron, he pretends that he offers a sacrifice to expiate the sins of the people. But where does Christ once mention sacrifice? He bids us take, eat, and drink. Who authorises men to convert *taking* into *offering*? And what is the effect of the change but to make the perpetual and inviolable edict of Christ yield to their devices? This is, indeed, a grievous evil. But still worse is the superstition which applies this work to the living and the dead, as a procuring cause of grace. In this way the efficacy of Christ's death has been transferred to a vain theatrical show, and the dignity of an eternal priesthood wrested from him to be bestowed upon men. If, at any time, the people are called to communion, they are admitted only to half a share. Why should this be? Christ holds forth the cup to all, and bids all drink of it: In opposition to this, men interdict the assembly of the faithful from touching the cup. Thus the signs, which by the authority of Christ were connected by an indissoluble tie, are separated by human caprice. Besides, the consecration, both of baptism and of the mass, differs in no respect whatever from magical incantations. For by breathings and whisperings, and unintelligible sounds, they think they work mysteries. As if it had been the wish of Christ, that in the performance of religious rites his word should be mumbled over, and not rather pronounced in a clear voice. There is no obscurity in the words by which the gospel expresses the power, nature, and use of baptism. Then, in the Supper, Christ does not mutter over the bread, but addresses the apostles in distinct terms, when he announces the promise and subjoins the command, "This do in remembrance of me." Instead of this public commemoration, they whisper out secret exorcisms, fitter, as I have observed, for magical arts than

Digitized by Google

sacraments. The first thing we complain of here is, that the people are entertained with showy ceremonies, while not a word is said of their significancy and truth. For there is no use in the sacraments unless the thing which the sign visibly represents is explained in accordance with the Word of God. Therefore, when the people are presented with nothing but empty figures, with which to feed the eye, while they hear no doctrine which might direct them to the proper end, they look no farther than the external act. Hence that most pestilential superstition, under which, as if the sacraments alone were sufficient for salvation, without feeling any solicitude about faith or repentance, or even Christ himself, they fasten upon the sign instead of the thing signified by it. And, indeed, not only among the rude vulgar, but in the schools also, the impious dogma everywhere obtained, that the sacraments were effectual by themselves, if not obstructed in their operation by mortal sin; as if the sacraments had been given for any other end or use than to lead us by the hand to Christ. Then, in addition to this, after consecrating the bread by a perverse incantation, rather than a pious rite, they keep it in a little box, and occasionally carry it about in solemn state, that it may be adored and prayed to instead of Christ. Accordingly, when any danger presses, they flee to that bread as their only protection, use it as a charm against all accidents, and, in asking pardon of God, employ it as the best expiation; as if Christ, when he gave us his body in the sacrament, had meant that it should be prostituted to all sorts of absurdity. For what is the amount of the promise? Simply this,—that as often as we received the sacrament, we should be partakers of his body and blood —"Take," says he, "eat and drink; this is my body, this is my blood. This do in remembrance of me." Do we not see that the promise is on either side inclosed by limits within which we must confine ourselves if we would secure what it offers? Those, therefore, are deceived who imagine that apart from the legitimate use of the sacrament, they have anything but common and unconsecrated bread. Then,

Digitized by Google

again, there is a profanation common to all these religious rites, viz., that they are made the subjects of a disgraceful traffic, as if they had been instituted for no other purpose than to be subservient to gain. Nor is this traffic conducted secretly or bashfully; it is plied openly, as at the public mart. It is known in each particular district how much a mass sells for. Other rites, too, have their fixed prices. In short, any one who considers must see that Churches are just ordinary shops, and that there is no kind of sacred rite which is not there exposed for sale.

Were I to go over the faults of ecclesiastical government in detail, I should never have done. I will, therefore, only point to some of the grosser sort, which cannot be disguised. And, first, the pastoral office itself, as instituted by Christ, has long been in desuetude. His object in appointing Bishops and Pastors, or whatever the name be by which they are called, certainly was, as Paul declares, that they might edify the Church with sound doctrine. According to this view, no man is a true pastor of the Church who does not perform the office of teaching. But, in the present day, almost all those who have the name of pastors have left that work to others. Scarcely one in a hundred of the Bishops will be found who ever mounts the pulpit in order to teach. And no wonder; for bishoprics have degenerated into secular principalities. Pastors of inferior rank, again, either think that they fulfil their office by frivolous performances altogether alien from the command of Christ, or, after the example of the Bishops, throw even this part of the duty on the shoulders of others. Hence the letting of sacerdotal offices is not less common than the letting of farms. What would we more? The spiritual government which Christ recommended has totally disappeared, and a new and mongrel species of government has been introduced, which, under whatever name it may pass current, has no more resemblance to the former than the world has to the kingdom of Christ. If it be objected, that the fault of those who neglect their duty ought not to be imputed to the order, I answer, first, that the evil is of such

Digitized by Google

general prevalence, that it may be regarded as the common rule; and, secondly, that, were we to assume that all the Bishops, and all the Presbyters under them, reside each in his particular station, and do what in the present day is regarded as professional duty, they would never fulfil the true institution of Christ. They would sing or mutter in the church, exhibit themselves in theatrical vestments, and go through numerous ceremonies, but they would seldom, if ever, teach. According to the precept of Christ, however, no man can claim for himself the office of bishop or pastor who does not feed his flock with the Word of the Lord.

Then while those who preside in the Church ought to excel others, and shine by the example of a holier life, how well do those who hold the office in the present day correspond in this respect to their vocation! At a time when the corruption of the world is at its height, there is no order more addicted to all kinds of wickedness. I wish that by their innocence they would refute what I say. How gladly would I at once retract. But their turpitude stands exposed to the eyes of all—exposed their insatiable avarice and rapacity—exposed their intolerable pride and cruelty. The noise of indecent revelry and dancing, the rage of gaming, and entertainments, abounding in all kinds of intemperance, are in their houses only ordinary occurrences, while they glory in their luxurious delicacies, as if they were distinguished virtues. To pass over other things in silence, what impurity in that celibacy which of itself they regard as a title to esteem! I feel ashamed to unveil enormities which I had much rather suppress, if they could be corrected by silence. Nor will I divulge what is done in secret. The pollutions which openly appear are more than sufficient. How many priests, pray, are free from whoredom? Nay, how many of their houses are infamous for daily acts of lewdness? How many honourable families do they defile by their vagabond lusts? For my part, I have no pleasure in exposing their vices, and it is no part of my design, but it is of importance to observe what a wide dif-

Digitized by Google

ference there is between the conduct of the priesthood of the present day, and that which true ministers of Christ and his Church are bound to pursue.

Not the least important branch of ecclesiastical government is the due and regular election and ordination of those who are to rule. The Word of God furnishes a standard by which all such appointments ought to be tested, and there exist many decrees of ancient Councils which carefully and wisely provide for every thing which relates to the proper method of election. Let our adversaries then produce even a solitary instance of canonical election, and I will yield them the victory. We know the kind of examination which the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of Paul, (Epistles of Timothy and Titus,) requires a pastor to undergo, and that which the ancient laws of the Fathers enjoin. At the present day, in appointing Bishops is anything of the kind perceived? Nay, how few of those who are raised to the office are endowed even slenderly with those qualities without which they cannot be fit ministers of the Church? We see the order which the Apostles observed in ordaining ministers, that which the primitive Church afterwards followed, and, finally, that which the ancient Canons require to be observed. Were I to complain that at present this order is spurned and rejected, would not the complaint be just? What, then, should I say that every thing honourable is trampled upon, and promotion obtained by the most disgraceful and flagitious proceedings? The fact is of universal notoriety. For ecclesiastical honours are either purchased for a set price, or seized by the hand of violence, or secured by nefarious actions, or acquired by sordid sycophancy. Occasionally even, they are the hire paid for panderism and similar services. In short, more shameless proceedings are exhibited here than ever occur in the acquisition of secular possessions.

And would that those who preside in the Church, when they corrupt its government, only sinned for themselves, or at least injured others by nothing but by their bad example! But the most crying evil of all is, that they exer-

Digitized by Google

cise a most cruel tyranny, and that a tyranny over souls. Nay, what is the vaunted power of the Church in the present day, but a lawless, licentious, unrestricted domination over souls, subjecting them to the most miserable bondage? Christ gave to the Apostles an authority similar to that which God had conferred on the Prophets, an authority exactly defined, viz., to act as his ambassadors to men. Now, the invariable law is, that he who is entrusted with an embassy must faithfully and religiously conform to his instructions. This is stated in express terms in the Apostolical commission,—"Go and teach all nations whatsoever things I have delivered unto you." Likewise "preach," (not anything you please,) but the "gospel." If it is asked what the authority is with which their successors were invested, we have the definition of Peter, which enjoins all who speak in the Church to speak "the oracles" of God. Now, however, those who would be thought the rulers of the Church arrogate to themselves a licence to speak whatsoever they please, and to insist that as soon as they have spoken they shall be implicitly obeyed. It will be averred that this is a calumny, and that the only right which they assume is that of sanctioning by their authority what the Holy Spirit has revealed. They will, accordingly, maintain that they do not subject the consciences of believers to their own devices or caprice, but only to the oracles of the Spirit, which, being revealed to them, they confirm and promulgate to others. Forsooth an ingenious pretext! No man doubts that in whatever the Holy Spirit delivers by their hands they are to be unhesitatingly obeyed. But when they add that they cannot deliver anything but the genuine oracles of the Holy Spirit, because they are under his guidance, and that all their decisions cannot but be true, because they sit in chairs of verity, is not this just to measure their power by their caprice? For if all their decrees, without exception, are to be received as oracles, there is no limit to their power. What tyrant ever so monstrously abused the patience of his subjects as to insist that every thing he proclaimed

Digitized by Google

should be received as a message from heaven! Tyrants, no doubt, will have their edicts obeyed, be the edicts what they may. But these men demand much more. We must believe that the Holy Spirit speaks when they obtrude upon us what they have dreamed.

We see, accordingly, how hard and iniquitous the bondage is in which, when armed with this power, they have enthralled the souls of the faithful. Laws have been piled above laws, to be so many snares to the conscience. For they have not confined these laws to matters of external order, but applied them to the interior and spiritual government of the soul. And no end was made until they amounted to that immense multitude, which now looks not unlike a labyrinth. Indeed, some of them seem framed for the very purpose of troubling and torturing consciences, while the observance of them is enforced with not less strictness than if they contained the whole substance of piety. Nay, though in regard to the violation of the commands of God, either no question is asked, or slight penances are inflicted, any thing done contrary to the decrees of men requires the highest expiation. While the Church is oppressed by this tyrannical yoke, any one who dares to say a word against it is instantly condemned as a heretic. In short, to give vent to our grief is a capital offence. And in order to ensure the possession of this insufferable domination, they, by sanguinary edicts, prevent the people from reading and understanding the Scriptures, and fulminate against those who stir any question as to their power. This excessive rigour increases from day to day, so that now on the subject of religion it is scarcely permitted to make any inquiry at all.

At the time when divine truth lay buried under this vast and dense cloud of darkness—when religion was sullied by so many impious superstitions—when by horrid blasphemies the worship of God was corrupted, and His glory laid prostrate—when by a multitude of perverse opinions, the benefit of redemption was frustrated, and men, intoxicated with a fatal confidence in works, sought salvation any where

Digitized by Google

rather than in Christ—when the administration of the Sacraments was partly maimed and torn asunder, partly adulterated by the admixture of numerous fictions, and partly profaned by traffickings for gain—when the government of the Church had degenerated into mere confusion and devastation—when those who sat in the seat of pastors first did most vital injury to the Church by the dissoluteness of their lives, and, secondly, exercised a cruel and most noxious tyranny over souls, by every kind of error, leading men like sheep to the slaughter;—then Luther arose, and after him others, who with united counsels sought out means and methods by which religion might be purged from all these defilements, the doctrine of godliness restored to its integrity, and the Church raised out of its calamitous into somewhat of a tolerable condition. The same course we are still pursuing in the present day.

I come now, as I proposed, to consider the remedies which we have employed for the correction of these evils, not here intending to describe the manner in which we proceeded, (that will afterwards be seen,) but only to make it manifest that we have had no other end in view than to ameliorate in some degree the very miserable condition of the Church. Our doctrine has been assailed, and still is every day, by many atrocious calumnies. Some declaim loudly against it in their sermons; others attack and traduce it in their writings. Both rake together every thing by which they hope to bring it into disrepute among the ignorant. But the Confession of our Faith, which we presented to your Imperial Majesty, is before the world, and clearly testifies how undeservedly we are harassed by so many odious accusations. And we have always been ready in times past, as we are at the present day, to render an account of our doctrine. In a word, there is no doctrine preached in our churches but that which we openly profess. As to controverted points, they are clearly and honestly explained in our Confession, while every thing re-

Digitized by Google

lating to them has been copiously treated and diligently expounded by our writers. Hence judges not unjust must be satisfied how far we are from every thing like impiety. This much, certainly, must be clear alike to just and unjust, that our reformers have done no small service to the Church, in stirring up the world as from the deep darkness of ignorance, to read the Scriptures, in labouring diligently to make them better understood, and in happily throwing light on certain points of doctrine of the highest practical importance. In sermons little else was heard than old wives' fables, and fictions equally frivolous. The schools resounded with brawling questions, but Scripture was seldom mentioned. Those who held the government of the Church made it their sole care to prevent any diminution of their gains, and, accordingly, had no difficulty in permitting whatever tended to fill their coffers. Even the most prejudiced, how much soever they may in other respects defame our doctrine, admit that our people have in some degree reformed these evils.

I am willing, however, that all the advantage which the Church may have derived from our labours shall have no effect in alleviating our fault, if in any other respect we have done her injury. Therefore, let there be an examination of our whole doctrine, of our form of administering the sacraments, and our method of governing the Church; and in none of these three things will it be found that we have made any change upon the ancient form, without attempting to restore it to the exact standard of the Word of God.

To return to the division which we formerly adopted. All our controversies concerning doctrine relate either to the legitimate worship of God, or to the ground of salvation. As to the former, unquestionably we do exhort men to worship God neither in a frigid nor a careless manner; and while we point out the mode, we neither lose sight of the end, nor omit any thing which bears upon the point. We proclaim the glory of God in terms far loftier than it was wont to be proclaimed before, and we earnestly labour to

Digitized by Google

make the perfections in which His glory shines better and better known. His benefits towards ourselves we extol as eloquently as we can, while we call upon others to reverence His Majesty, render due homage to His greatness, feel due gratitude for His mercies, and unite in showing forth His praise. In this way there is infused into their hearts that solid confidence which afterwards gives birth to prayer; and in this way, too, each one is trained to genuine self-denial, so that his will being brought into obedience to God, he bids farewell to his own desires. In short, as God requires us to worship Him in a spiritual manner, so we most zealously urge men to all the spiritual sacrifices which He recommends.

Even our enemies cannot deny our assiduity in exhorting men to expect the good which they desire from none but God, to confide in His power, rest in His goodness, depend on His truth, and turn to Him with the whole heart—to recline upon Him with full hope, and recur to Him in necessity, that is, at every moment to ascribe to Him every good thing which we enjoy, and show we do so by open expressions of praise. And that none may be deterred by difficulty of access, we proclaim that a complete fountain of blessings is opened up to us in Christ, and that out of it we may draw for every need. Our writings are witnesses, and our sermons witnesses, how frequent and sedulous we are in recommending true repentance, urging men to renounce their own reason and carnal desires, and themselves entirely, that they may be brought into obedience to God alone, and live no longer to themselves, but to Him. Nor, at the same time, do we overlook external duties and works of charity, which follow on such renovation. This, I say, is the sure and unerring form of worship, which we know that He approves, because it is the form which His word prescribes, and these the only sacrifices of the Christian Church which have His sanction.

Since, therefore, in our churches, only God is adored in pious form without superstition, since His goodness, wisdom, power, truth, and other perfections, are there preached more fully than any where else—since He is invoked with true faith

Digitized by Google

in the name of Christ, His mercies celebrated both with heart and tongue, and men constantly urged to a simple and sincere obedience; since, in fine, nothing is heard but what tends to promote the sanctification of His name, what cause have those who call themselves Christians to be so inveterate against us? First, loving darkness rather than light, they cannot tolerate the sharpness with which we, as in duty bound, rebuke the gross idolatry which is every where beheld in the world. When God is worshipped in images, when fictitious worship is instituted in His name, when supplication is made to the images of saints, and divine honours paid to dead men's bones, against these, and similar abominations, we protest, describing them in their true colours. For this cause, those who hate our doctrine inveigh against us, and represent us as heretics who have dared to abolish the worship of God, as of old approved by the Church. Concerning this name of *church*, which they are ever and anon holding up before them as a kind of shield, we will shortly speak. Meanwhile, how perverse, when these flagitious corruptions are manifest, not only to defend them, but cloak their deformity, by impudently pretending that they belong to the genuine worship of God!

Both parties confess, that in the sight of God idolatry is an execrable crime. But when we attack the worship of images, our adversaries immediately take the opposite side, and lend their support to the crime which they had verbally concurred with us in condemning. Nay, what is more ridiculous, after agreeing with us as to the term in Greek, it is no sooner turned into Latin than their opposition begins. For they strenuously defend the worship of images, though they condemn idolatry—ingenious men denying that the honour which they pay to images is worship; as if, in comparing it with ancient idolatry, it were possible to see any difference. Idolaters pretended that they worshipped the celestial gods, though under corporeal figures which represented them. What else do our adversaries pretend? But does God accept of such excuses? Did the prophets cease to rebuke the madness of the Egyptians, when, out of the secret mysteries

Digitized by Google

of their theology, they drew subtle distinctions under which to screen themselves? What, too, do we suppose the brazen serpent, whom the Jews worshipped, to have been, but something which they honoured as a representation of God? "The Gentiles," says Ambrose, (in Psal. cxviii.,) "worship wood, because they think it an image of God, whereas the invisible image of God is not in that which is seen, but specially in that which is not seen." And what is it that is done in the present day? Do they not prostrate themselves before images, as if God were present in them? Did they not suppose the power and grace of God attached to pictures and statues, would they flee to them when they are desirous to pray?

I have not yet adverted to the grosser superstitions, though these cannot be confined to the ignorant, since they are approved by public consent. They adorn their idols now with flowers and chaplets, now with robes, vests, zones, purses, and frivolities of every kind. They light tapers and burn incense before them, and carry them on their shoulders in solemn state. When they pray to the image of Christopher or Barbara, they mutter over the Lord's Prayer and the angels' salutation. The fairer or dingier the images are, the greater is their excellence supposed to be. To this is added a new recommendation from fabulous miracles. Some they pretend to have spoken, others to have extinguished a fire in the church by trampling on it, others to have removed of their own accord to a new abode, others to have dropt from heaven. While the whole world teems with these and similar deluslons, and the fact is perfectly notorious, we, who have brought back the worship of the one God to the rule of his Word, we, who are blameless in this matter, and have purged our churches, not only of idolatry but of superstition also, are accused of violating the worship of God, because we have discarded the worship of images, that is, as we call it, *idolatry*, but as our adversaries will have it, *idolodulia*.

But, besides the clear testimonies which are everywhere met with in Scripture, we are also supported by the authority of the ancient Church. All the writers of a purer age de-

Digitized by Google

scribe the abuse of images among the Gentiles as not differing from what is seen in the world in the present day; and their observations on the subject are not less applicable to the present age than to the persons whom they then censured. As to the charge which they bring against us for discarding images, as well as the bones and relics of saints, it is easily answered. For none of these things ought to be valued at more than the brazen serpent, and the reasons for removing them were not less valid than those of Hezekiah for breaking it. It is certain that the *idolomania*, with which the minds of men are now fascinated, cannot be cured otherwise than by removing bodily the source of the infatuation. And we have too much experience of the absolute truth of St Augustine's sentiment, (Ep. xlix.) "No man prays or worships looking on an image without being impressed with the idea that it is listening to him." And, likewise, (in Psalm cxv. 4,) "Images, from having a mouth, eyes, ears, and feet, are more effectual to mislead an unhappy soul than to correct it, because they neither speak, nor see, nor hear, nor walk." Also, "The effect in a manner extorted by the external shape is, that the soul living in a body, thinks a body which it sees so very like its own must have similar powers of perception." As to the matter of relics, it is almost incredible how impudently the world has been cheated. I can mention three relics of our Saviour's circumcision; likewise fourteen nails which are exhibited for the three by which he was fixed to the cross; three robes for that seamless one on which the soldiers cast lots; two inscriptions that were placed over the cross; three spears by which our Saviour's side was pierced, and about five sets of linen clothes which wrapt his body in the tomb. Besides, they show all the articles used at the institution of the Lord's Supper, and an infinite number of similar impositions. There is no saint of any celebrity of whom two or three bodies are not in existence. I can name the place where a piece of pumice stone was long held in high veneration as the skull of Peter. Decency will not permit me to mention fouler exhibitions. Undeservedly, therefore,

Digitized by Google

are we blamed for having studied to purify the Church of God from such pollutions.

In regard to the worship of God, our adversaries next accuse us, because, omitting empty and childish observances, tending only to hypocrisy, we worship God more simply. That we have in no respect detracted from the spiritual worship of God, is attested by fact. Nay, when it had in a great measure gone into desuetude, we have reinstated it in its former rights. Let us now see whether the offence taken at us is just. In regard to doctrine, I maintain that we make common cause with the prophets. For, next to idolatry, there is nothing for which they rebuke the people more sharply than for falsely imagining that the worship of God consisted in external show. For what is the sum of their declarations? That God dwells not, and sets no value on ceremonies considered only in themselves, that he looks to the faith and truth of the heart, and that the only end for which he commanded, and for which he approves them, is, that they may be pure exercises of faith, and prayer, and praise. The writings of all the prophets are full of attestations to this effect. Nor, as I have observed, was there any thing for which they laboured more. Now, it cannot, without effrontery, be denied, that when our Reformers appeared, the world was more than ever smitten with this blindness. It was therefore absolutely necessary to urge men with these prophetical rebukes, and draw them off, as by force, from that infatuation, that they might no longer imagine that God was satisfied with naked ceremonies, as children are with shows. There was a like necessity for urging the doctrine of the spiritual worship of God—a doctrine which had almost vanished from the minds of men. That both of these things have been faithfully performed by us in times past, and still are, both our writings and our sermons clearly prove.

In inveighing against ceremonies themselves, and also in abrogating a great part of them, we confess that there is some difference between us and the prophets. They inveighed against their countrymen for confining the worship of God to external ceremonies; but still ceremonies which

Digitized by Google

God himself had instituted; we complain that the same honour is paid to frivolities of man's devising. They, while condemning superstition, left untouched a multitude of ceremonies which God had enjoined, and which were useful and appropriate to an age of tutelage; our business has been to correct numerous rites which had either crept in through oversight, or been turned to abuse; and which, moreover, by no means accorded with the time. For, if we would not throw every thing into confusion, we must never lose sight of the distinction between the old and the new dispensations, and of the fact that ceremonies, the observance of which was useful under the law, are now not only superfluous, but vicious and absurd. When Christ was absent and not yet manifested, ceremonies, by shadowing him forth, cherished the hope of his advent in the breasts of believers; but now that his glory is present and conspicuous, they only obscure it. And we see what God himself has done. For those ceremonies which He had commanded for a time He has now abrogated for ever. Paul explains the reason,—first, that since the body has been manifested in Christ, the types have, of course, been withdrawn; and, secondly, that God is now pleased to instruct his Church after a different manner, (Gal. iv. 5; Col. ii. 4, 14, 17.) Since, then, God has freed his Church from the bondage which he had imposed upon it, can anything, I ask, be more perverse than for men to introduce a new bondage in place of the old? Since God has prescribed a certain economy, how presumptuous to set up one which is contrary to it, and openly repudiated by Him! But the worst of all is, that though God has so often and so strictly interdicted all modes of worship prescribed by man, the only worship paid to him consisted of human inventions. What ground, then, have our enemies to vociferate that in this matter we have given religion to the winds? First, we have not laid even a finger on anything which Christ does not discountenance as of no value, when he declares that it is vain to worship God with human traditions. The thing might, perhaps, have been more tolerable if the only effect had been that men lost their pains by an unavailing worship: but since as I

Digitized by Google

have observed, God in many passages forbids any new worship unsanctioned by his Word; since he declares that he is grievously offended with the presumption which invents such worship, and threatens it with severe punishment, it is clear that the reformation which we have introduced was demanded by a strong necessity.

I am not unaware how difficult it is to persuade the world that God rejects and even abominates every thing relating to his worship that is devised by human reason. The delusion on this head is owing to several causes,—"Every one thinks highly of his own," as the old proverb expresses it. Hence the offspring of our own brain delights us, and besides, as Paul admits, this fictitious worship often presents some show of wisdom. Then, as it has for the most part an external splendour which pleases the eye, it is more agreeable to our carnal nature, than that which alone God requires and approves, but which is less ostentatious. But there is nothing which so blinds the understandings of men, and misleads them in their judgments in this matter, as hypocrisy. For while it is incumbent on true worshippers to give the heart and mind, men are always desirous to invent a mode of serving God of a totally different description, their object being to perform to him certain bodily observances, and keep the mind to themselves. Moreover, they imagine that when they obtrude upon him external pomp, they have, by this artifice, evaded the necessity of giving themselves. And this is the reason why they submit to innumerable observances which miserably fatigue them without measure and without end, and why they choose to wander in a perpetual labyrinth, rather than worship God simply in spirit and in truth.

It is mere calumny, then, in our enemies to accuse us of alluring men by facilities and indulgence. For were the option given, there is nothing which the carnal man would not prefer to do rather than consent to worship God as prescribed by our doctrine. It is easy to use the words faith and repentance, but the things are most difficult to perform. He, therefore, who makes the worship of God consist in these, by no means loosens the reins of discipline, but com-

Digitized by Google

pels men to the course which they are most afraid to take. Of this we have most pregnant proof from fact. Men will allow themselves to be astricted by numerous severe laws, to be obliged to numerous laborious observances, to wear a severe and heavy yoke; in short, there is no annoyance to which they will not submit, provided there is no mention of the heart. Hence, it appears, that there is nothing to which the human mind is more averse than to that spiritual truth which is the constant topic of our sermons, and nothing with which it is more engrossed than that splendid glare on which our adversaries so strongly insist. The very Majesty of God extorts this much from us, that we are unable to withdraw entirely from his service. Therefore, as we cannot evade the necessity of worshipping him, our only remaining course is to seek out indirect substitutes that we may not be obliged to come directly into his presence; or rather, by means of external ceremonies, like specious masks, we hide the inward malice of the heart, and, in order that we may not be forced to give it to him, interpose bodily observances, like a wall of partition. It is with the greatest reluctance that the world allows itself to be driven from such subterfuges as these; and hence the outcry against us for having dragged them out into the open light of day, out of their lurking places, where they securely sported with God.

In prayer there are three things which we have corrected. Discarding the intercession of saints, we have brought men back to Christ, that they might learn both to invoke the Father in his name, and trust in him as Mediator, and we have taught them to pray, first, with firm and solid confidence, and, secondly, with understanding also, instead of continuing as formerly to mutter over confused prayers in an unknown tongue. Here we are assailed with bitter reproaches as at once acting contumeliously towards the saints, and defrauding believers of an invaluable privilege. Both charges we deny. It is no injury to saints not to permit the office of Christ to be attributed to them, and there is no honour of which we deprive them, save that which was improperly and rashly bestowed upon them by human error.

Digitized by Google

I will not mention anything which may not be pointed to with the finger. First, when men are about to pray, they imagine God to be at a great distance, and that they cannot have access to him without the guidance of some patron. Nor is this false opinion current among the rude and unlearned only, but even those who would be thought leaders of the blind entertain it. Then, in looking out for patrons, every one follows his own fancy. One selects Mary, another Michael, another Peter. Christ they very seldom honour with a place in the list. Nay, there is scarcely one in a hundred who would not be amazed, as at some new prodigy, were he to hear Christ named as an intercessor. Therefore, passing by Christ, they all trust to the patronage of saints. Then the superstition creeps in farther and farther, till they invoke the saints promiscuously, just as they do God. I admit, indeed, that when they desire to speak more definitely, all they ask of the saints is to assist them before God with their prayers. But more frequently, confounding this distinction, they address and implore at one time God, and at another the saints, just according to the impulse of the moment. Nay, each saint has a peculiar province allotted to him. One gives rain, another fair weather, one delivers from fever, another from shipwreck. But, to say nothing of these profane heathen delusions which everywhere prevail in churches, this one impiety may suffice for all, that the great body of mankind, in inviting intercessors from this quarter and from that, neglect Christ, the only one whom God has set forth, and confide less in the Divine protection than in the patronage of saints.

But our censurers, even those of them who have somewhat more regard to equity, blame us for excess in having discarded entirely from our prayers the mention of dead saints. But will they tell me wherein, according to their view, lies the sin of faithfully observing the rule laid down by Christ, the Supreme Teacher, and by the Prophets and Apostles, and of not omitting any thing which either the Holy Spirit has taught in Scripture, or the servants of God have practised from the beginning of the world down to the days of the

Digitized by Google

Apostles? There is scarcely any subject on which the Holy Spirit more carefully prescribes than on the proper method of prayer; but there is not a syllable which teaches us to have recourse to the assistance of dead saints. Many of the prayers offered up by believers are extant. In none of them is there even a single example of such recourse. Sometimes, indeed, the Israelites entreated God to remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and David likewise. But all they meant by such expressions was, that he should be mindful of the covenant which he had made with them, and bless their posterity according to his promise. For the covenant of grace, which was ultimately to be ratified in Christ, those holy patriarchs had received in their own name, and in that of their posterity. Wherefore, the faithful of the Israelitish Church do not, by such mention of the patriarchs, seek intercession from the dead, but simply appeal to the promise which had been deposited with them until it should be fully ratified in the hand of Christ. How extravagant, then, and infatuated, to abandon the form of prayer which the Lord has recommended, and without any injunction, and with no example, to introduce into prayer the intercession of saints? But briefly to conclude this point, I take my stand on the declaration of Paul, that no prayer is genuine which springs not from faith, and that faith cometh by the Word of God, (Rom. x. 14.) In these words, he has, if I mistake not, distinctly intimated that the Word of God is the only sure foundation for prayer. And while he elsewhere says, that every action of our lives should be preceded by faith, *i. e.*, a conscientious assurance, he shows that this is specially requisite in prayer, more so, indeed, than in any other employment. It is, however, still more conclusive of the point, when he declares that prayer depends on the Word of God. For it is just as if he had prohibited all men from opening their mouths until such time as God puts words into them. This is our wall of brass, which all the powers of hell will in vain attempt to break down. Since, then, there exists a clear command to invoke God only; since, again, one Mediator is proposed, whose intercession must support our

Digitized by Google

prayers; since a promise has, moreover, been added, that whatever we ask in the name of Christ we shall obtain, men must pardon us, if we follow the certain truth of God, in preference to their frivolous fictions. It is surely incumbent on those who, in their prayers, introduce the intercession of the dead, that they may thereby be assisted more easily to obtain what they ask, to prove one of two things,—either that they are so taught by the Word of God, or that men have licence to pray as they please. But in regard to the former, it is plain that they are destitute of authority from the Scriptures, as well as of any approved example of such intercession, while, as to the latter, Paul declares that none can invoke God, save those who have been taught by his Word to pray. On this depends the confidence with which it becomes pious minds to be actuated and imbued when they engage in prayer. The men of the world supplicate God, dubious, meanwhile, of success. For they neither rely upon the promise, nor perceive the force of what is meant by having a Mediator through whom they will assuredly obtain what they ask. Moreover, God enjoins us to come free from doubt, (Matth. xxi. 22.) Accordingly, prayer proceeding from true faith obtains favour with God; whereas prayer accompanied with distrust rather alienates Him from us. For this is the proper mark which discriminates between genuine invocation and the profane wandering prayers of the heathen. And, indeed, where faith is wanting, prayer ceases to be divine worship. It is to this James refers when he says, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God; but let him ask in faith, doubting nothing. For he that doubteth is like a wave of the sea, driven with the winds, and tossed," (James i. 6.) It is not surprising that he who has no interest in Christ, the true Mediator, thus fluctuates in uncertainty and distrust. For, as Paul declares, it is through Christ only that we have boldness and access with confidence to the Father. We have, therefore, taught men when brought to Christ no longer to doubt and waver in their prayers, as they were wont to do, but to rest secure in the word of the Lord, a word which, when it once pene-

Digitized by Google

trates the soul, drives far from it all dubiety, which is repugnant to faith.

It remains to point out the third fault in prayer, which I said that we have corrected. Whereas men generally prayed in an unknown tongue, we have taught them to pray with understanding. Every man, accordingly, is taught by our doctrine to know, when he prays in private, what it is he asks of God, while the public prayers in our churches are framed so as to be understood by all. And it is the dictate of natural reason that it should be so, even if God had given no precept on the subject. For the design of prayer is to make God the conscious witness of our necessities, and as it were to pour out our hearts before him. But nothing is more at variance with this design than to move the tongue without thought and intelligence. And yet, to such a degree of absurdity had it come, that to pray in the vulgar tongue was almost regarded as an offence against religion. I can name an Archbishop who threatened with incarceration, and the severer penances, the person who should repeat the Lord's Prayer aloud in any language but Latin. The general belief, however, was, that it mattered not in what language a man prayed at home, provided he had what was called a final intention directed to prayer; but that in churches the dignity of the service required that Latin should be the only language in which prayers were couched.

There seems, as I lately observed, something monstrous in this determination to hold converse with God in sounds which fall without meaning from the tongue. Even if God did not declare his displeasure, nature herself, without a monitor, rejects it. Besides, it is easy to infer from the whole tenor of Scripture how deeply God abominates such an invention. As to the public prayers of the Church, the words of Paul are clear—the unlearned cannot say Amen if the benediction is pronounced in an unknown tongue. And this makes it the more strange, that those who first introduced this perverse practice, ultimately had the effrontery to maintain, that the very thing which Paul regards as in-

Digitized by Google

effably absurd, was conducive to the majesty of prayer. The method by which, in our churches, all pray in common in the popular tongue, and males and females indiscriminately sing the Psalms, our adversaries may ridicule if they will, provided the Holy Spirit bears testimony to us from heaven, while he repudiates the confused, unmeaning sounds which are uttered elsewhere.

In the second principal branch of doctrine, viz., that which relates to the ground of salvation, and the method of obtaining it, many questions are involved: For, when we tell a man to seek righteousness and life out of himself, *i. e.*, in Christ only, because he has nothing in himself but sin and death, a controversy immediately arises with reference to the freedom and powers of the will. For, if man has any ability of his own to serve God, he does not obtain salvation entirely by the grace of Christ, but in part bestows it on himself. On the other hand, if the whole of salvation is attributed to the grace of Christ, man has nothing left, has no virtue of his own by which he can assist himself to procure salvation. But though our opponents concede that man, in every good deed, is assisted by the Holy Spirit, they nevertheless claim for him a share in the operation. This they do, because they perceive not how deep the wound is which was inflicted on our nature by the fall of our first parents. No doubt, they agree with us in holding the doctrine of original sin, but they afterwards modify its effects, maintaining that the powers of man are only weakened, not wholly depraved. Their view, accordingly, is, that man, being tainted with original corruption, is, in consequence of the weakening of his powers, unable to act aright; but that, being aided by the grace of God, he has something of his own, and from himself, which he is able to contribute. We, again, though we deny not that man acts spontaneously, and of free will, when he is guided by the Holy Spirit, maintain that his whole nature is so imbued with depravity, that of himself he possesses no ability whatever to act aright. Thus far, therefore, do we dissent

Digitized by Google

from those who oppose our doctrine, that while they neither humble man sufficiently, nor duly estimate the blessing of regeneration, we lay him completely prostrate, that he may become sensible of his utter insufficiency in regard to spiritual righteousness, and learn to seek it, not partially, but wholly, from God. To some not very equitable judges, we seem, perhaps, to carry the matter too far; but there is nothing absurd in our doctrine, or at variance either with Scripture or with the general consent of the ancient Church. Nay, we are able, without any difficulty, to confirm our doctrine to the very letter out of the mouth of Augustine; and, accordingly, several of those who are otherwise disaffected to our cause, but somewhat sounder in their judgments, do not venture to contradict us on this head. It is certain, as I have already observed, that we differ from others only in this, that by convincing man of his poverty and powerlessness, we train him more effectually to true humility, leading him to renounce all self-confidence, and throw himself entirely upon God; and that, in like manner, we train him more effectually to gratitude, by leading him to ascribe, as in truth he ought, every good thing which he possesses to the kindness of God. They, on the other hand, intoxicating him with a perverse opinion of his own virtue, precipitate his ruin, inflating him with impious arrogance against God, to whom he ascribes the glory of his justification in no greater degree than to himself. To these errors they add a third, viz., that, in all their discussions concerning the corruption of human nature, they usually stop short at the grosser carnal desires, without touching on deeper-seated and more deadly diseases; and hence it is, that those who are trained in their school easily forgive themselves the foulest sins, as no sins at all, provided they are hid.

The next question relates to the value and merit of works. We both render to good works their due praise, and we deny not that a reward is reserved for them with God; but we take three exceptions, on which the whole of our re-

Digitized by Google

maining controversy concerning the work of salvation hinges.

First, we maintain, that of what description soever any man's works may be, he is regarded as righteous before God, simply on the footing of gratuitous mercy; because God, without any respect to works, freely adopts him in Christ, by imputing the righteousness of Christ to him, as if it were his own. This we call the righteousness of faith, viz., when a man, made void and empty of all confidence in works, feels convinced that the only ground of his acceptance with God is a righteousness which is wanting to himself, and is borrowed from Christ. The point on which the world always goes astray, (for this error has prevailed in almost every age,) is in imagining that man, however partially defective he may be, still in some degree merits the favour of God by works. But Scripture declares, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them." Under this curse must necessarily lie all who are judged by works—none being exempted save those who entirely renounce all confidence in works, and put on Christ, that they may be justified in Him, by the gratuitous acceptance of God. The ground of our justification, therefore, is, that God reconciles us to himself, from regard not to our works, but to Christ alone, and, by gratuitous adoption, makes us, instead of children of wrath, to be his own children. So long as God looks to our works, he perceives no reason why he ought to love us. Wherefore, it is necessary to bury our sins, and impute to us the obedience of Christ, (because the only obedience which can stand his scrutiny,) and adopt us as righteous through His merits. This is the clear and uniform doctrine of Scripture, "witnessed," as Paul says, "by the law and the prophets," (Rom. iii. 21;) and so explained by the gospel, that a clearer law cannot be desired. Paul contrasts the righteousness of the law with the righteousness of the gospel, placing the former in works, and the latter in the grace of Christ, (Rom. x. 5, &c.) He does not divide it

Digitized by Google

into two halves, giving works the one, and Christ the other; but he ascribes it to Christ entirely, that we are judged righteous in the sight of God.

There are here two questions; *first*, whether the glory of our salvation is to be divided between ourselves and God: and, *secondly*, whether, as in the sight of God, our conscience can with safety put any confidence in works. On the former question, Paul's decision is—let every mouth "be stopped, and the whole world become guilty before God." "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God—being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus;" and that "to declare His righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," (Rom. iii. 19, &c.) We simply follow this definition, while our opponents maintain that man is not justified by the grace of God, in any sense which does not reserve part of the praise for his own works.

On the second question, Paul reasons thus: "If they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Whence he concludes "it is of faith," "to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed," (Rom. iv. 14, 16.) And again, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God," (Rom. v. 1;) and no longer dread His presence. And he intimates, that every one feels in his own experience, that our consciences cannot but be in perpetual disquietude and fluctuation, so long as we look for protection from works, and that we enjoy serene and placid tranquillity then only, when we have recourse to Christ as the only haven of true confidence. We add nothing to Paul's doctrine; but that restless dubiety of conscience, which he regards as absurd, is placed by our opponents among the primary axioms of their faith.

The second exception which we take relates to the remission of sins. Our opponents, not being able to deny that men, during their whole lives, walk haltingly, and oftentimes even fall, are obliged, whether they will or not, to confess that all need pardon, in order to supply their want

Digitized by Google

of righteousness. But then they have imaginary satisfactions, by means of which those who have sinned purchase back the favour of God. In this class, they place first contrition, and next works, which they term works of supererogation, and penances, which God inflicts on sinners. But, as they are still sensible that these compensations fall far short of the just measure required, they call in the aid of a new species of satisfaction from another quarter, namely, from the benefit of the keys. And they say, that by the keys the treasury of the Church is unlocked, and what is wanting to ourselves supplied out of the merits of Christ and the saints. We, on the contrary, maintain that the sins of men are forgiven freely, and we acknowledge no other satisfaction than that which Christ accomplished, when, by the sacrifice of his death, he expiated our sins. Therefore, we preach that it is the purchase of Christ alone which reconciles us to God, and that no compensations are taken into account, because our heavenly Father, contented with the sole expiation of Christ, requires none from us. In the Scriptures we have clear proof of this our doctrine, which, indeed, ought to be called not ours, but rather that of the Church Catholic. For the only method of regaining the divine favour, set forth by the Apostle, is, that "He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," (2 Cor. v. 21.) And in another passage, where he is speaking of the remission of sins, he declares that through it righteousness without works is imputed to us, (Rom. vi. 5.) We, therefore, strenuously, yet truly, maintain that their idea of meriting reconciliation with God by satisfactions, and buying off the penalties due to his justice, is execrable blasphemy, in as much as it destroys the doctrine which Isaiah delivers concerning Christ—that "the chastisement of our peace was upon Him," (Isaiah liii. 5.)

The absurd fiction concerning works of supererogation we discard for many reasons; but there are two of more than sufficient weight—the one, that it is impossible to tolerate the idea of man being able to perform to God more

Digitized by Google

than he ought; and the other, that as by the term supererogation, they for the most part understand voluntary acts of worship which their own brain has devised, and which they obtrude upon God, it is lost labour and pains, so far are such acts from having any title to be regarded as expiations which appease the divine anger. Moreover, that mixing up of the blood of Christ with the blood of martyrs, and forming out of them a heterogeneous mass of merits or satisfactions, to buy off the punishments due to sin, are things which we have not tolerated, and which we ought not to tolerate. For, as Augustine says, (*Tract. in Joan.* 84,) "No martyr's blood has been shed for the remission of sins. This was the work of Christ alone, and in this work he has bestowed not a thing which we should imitate, but one we should gratefully receive." With Augustine Leo admirably accords, when he thus writes, (*Ep.* 81, *item*, 97,) "Though precious in the sight of God has been the death of his many saints, yet no innocent man's slaughter was the propitiation of the world; the just received crowns, did not give them, and the constancy of the faithful has furnished examples of patience, not gifts of righteousness."

Our third and last exception relates to the recompence of works—we maintaining that it depends not on their own value or merit, but rather on the mere benignity of God. Our opponents, indeed, admit that there is no proportion between the merit of the work and its reward; but they do not attend to what is of primary moment in the matter, viz., that the good works of believers are never so pure as that they can please without pardon. They consider not, I say, that they are always sprinkled with some spots or blemishes, because they never proceed from that pure and perfect love of God which is demanded by the Law. Our doctrine, therefore, is, that the good works of believers are always devoid of a spotless purity which can stand the inspection of God; nay, that when they are tried by the strict rule of justice, they are, to a certain extent, impure. But, when once God has graciously adopted believers, he not only

Digitized by Google

accepts and loves their persons, but their works also, and condescends to honour them with a reward. In one word, as we said of man, so we may say of works,—they are justified not by their own desert, but by the merits of Christ alone; the faults by which they would otherwise displease being covered by the sacrifice of Christ. This consideration is of very great practical importance, both in retaining men in the fear of God, that they may not arrogate to their works that which proceeds from his fatherly kindness; and also in inspiring them with the best consolation, and so preventing them from giving way to despondency, when they reflect on the imperfection or impurity of their works, by reminding them that God, of his paternal indulgence, is pleased to pardon it.

Having considered the two principal heads of doctrine, we come now to the Sacraments, in which we have not made any correction which we are unable to defend by sure and approved authority. Whereas, seven sacraments were supposed to have been instituted by Christ, we have discarded five of the number, and have demonstrated them to be ceremonies of man's devising, with the exception of marriage, which we acknowledge to have been indeed commanded by God, but not in order that it might be a sacrament. Nor is it a dispute about nothing when we separate rites thus superadded on the part of men, though, in other respects, they should be neither wicked nor useless, from those symbols which Christ with his own lips committed to us, and was pleased to make the testimonials of spiritual gifts,—gifts to which, as they are not in the power of man, men have no right to testify. It is assuredly no vulgar matter to seal upon our hearts the sacred favour of God, to offer Christ, and give a visible representation of the blessings which we enjoy in him. This being the office of the sacraments, not to discriminate between them and rites originating with man, is to confound heaven with earth. Here, indeed, a twofold error had prevailed. Making no distinction between things human and divine, they

Digitized by Google

derogated exceedingly from the sacred Word of God, on which the whole power of the sacraments depends, while they also falsely imagined Christ to be the author of rites which had no higher than a human origin.

From baptism, in like manner, have we rescinded many additions which were partly useless, and partly, from their superstitious tendency, noxious. We know the form of baptism which the apostles received from Christ, which they observed during their lifetime, and which they finally left to posterity. But the simplicity which had been approved by the authority of Christ, and the practice of the apostles, did not satisfy succeeding ages. I am not at present discussing whether those persons were influenced by sound reasons, who afterwards added chrism, salt, spittle, and tapers. I only say, what every one must know, that to such a height had superstition or folly risen, that more value was set on these additions than on the genuineness of baptism itself. We have studied also to banish the preposterous confidence which stopped short at the external act, and paid not the least regard to Christ. For, as well in the schools as in sermons, they so extolled the efficacy of signs, that, instead of directing men to Christ, they taught them to confide in the visible elements. Lastly, we have brought into our Churches the ancient custom of accompanying the administration of the sacraments with an explanation of the doctrine contained in it, and at the same time expounding with all diligence and fidelity both their advantages and their legitimate use; so that, in this respect, even our opponents cannot find any ground of censure. But nothing is more alien to the nature of a sacrament than to set before the people an empty spectacle, unaccompanied with explanation of the mystery. There is a well-known passage quoted by Gratian out of Augustine—"If the word is wanting, the water is nothing but an element." What he means by *word* he immediately explains when he says, "That is, the word of faith which we preach." Our opponents, therefore, ought not to think it a novelty when we disapprove of mere exhibition of the mystery. For this is a sacrilegious divorce, which reverses the order instituted by

Digitized by Google

Christ. Another additional fault in the mode of administration, commonly used elsewhere, is, that the thing which they consider as a religious act is not understood, just as is the case in the performance of magical incantations.

I have already observed, that the other sacrament of the Christian Church, the Holy Supper of our Lord, was not only corrupted, but nearly abolished. Wherefore it was the more necessary for us to labour in restoring its purity. First, it was necessary to eradicate from the minds of men that impious fiction of sacrifice, the source of many absurdities. For, besides the introduction of a rite of *oblation* in opposition to the express institution of Christ, there had been added a most pestilential opinion, that this act of oblation was an expiation for sin. Thus, the dignity of the priesthood, which belonged exclusively to Christ, had been transferred to mortal men, and the virtue of his death to their own act. Thus, also, it had come to be applied in behalf of the living and the dead. We have, therefore, abrogated that fictitious immolation and restored communion, which had been in a very great measure obsolete. For, provided men went once a year to the Lord's Table, they thought it enough, for all the remainder of that period, to be spectators of what was done by the priest, under the pretext, indeed, of administering the Lord's Supper, but without any vestige of the Supper in it. For what are the words of the Lord? Take, says he, and distribute among yourselves. But in the mass, instead of *taking*, there is a pretence of *offering*, while there is no distribution, and even no invitation. The priest, like a member cut off from the rest of the body, prepares it for himself alone. How immense the difference between the things! We have, besides, restored to the people the use of the cup, which, though it was not only permitted, but committed to them by our Lord, was taken from them (it could only be) at the suggestion of Satan. Of ceremonies, there are numbers which we have discarded, partly because they had multiplied out of measure, partly because some savoured too much of Judaism, and others, the inventions of ignorant men, ill accorded with the

Digitized by Google

gravity of so high a mystery. But, granting that there was no other evil in them than that they had crept in through oversight, was it not a sufficient ground for their abolition that we saw the vulgar gazing upon them in stupid amazement?

In condemning the fiction of transubstantiation, and likewise the custom of keeping and carrying about the bread, we were impelled by a stronger necessity. First, it is repugnant to the plain words of Christ; and, secondly, it is abhorrent to the very nature of a sacrament. For there is no sacrament where there is no visible symbol to correspond to the spiritual truth which it represents. And with regard to the Supper, what Paul says is clear,—"We being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread," (1 Cor. x. 17.) Where is the analogy or similitude of a visible sign in the Supper to correspond to the body and blood of our Lord, if it is neither bread that we eat, nor wine that we drink, but only some empty phantom that mocks the eye? Add that to this fiction a worse superstition perpetually adheres, viz., that men cling to that bread as if to God, and worship it as God, in the manner in which we have seen it done. While the sacrament ought to have been a means of raising pious minds to heaven, the sacred symbols of the Supper were abused to an entirely different purpose, and men, contented with gazing upon them and worshipping them, never once thought of Christ.

The carrying about of the bread in solemn state, or setting it on an elevated spot to be adored, are corruptions altogether inconsistent with the institution of Christ. For in the Supper the Lord sets before us his body and blood, but it is in order that we may eat and drink. Accordingly, he, in the first place, gives the command, by which he bids us take, eat, and drink, and then he, in the next place, subjoins and annexes the promise, in which he testifies, that what we eat is his body, and what we drink is his blood. Those, therefore, who either keep the bread set apart, or who carry it about to be worshipped, seeing they separate the promise from the command, in other words, sever an indissoluble tie,

Digitized by Google

imagine, indeed, that they have the body of Christ, whereas, in fact, they have nothing but an idol which they have devised for themselves. For this promise of Christ, by which he offers his own body and blood under the symbols of bread and wine, belongs to those only who receive them at his hand, to celebrate the mystery in the manner which he enjoins; while to those who at their own hand pervert them to a different purpose, and so have not the promise, there remains nothing but their own dream.

Lastly, we have revived the practice of explaining the doctrine and unfolding the mystery to the people; whereas, formerly, the priest not only used a strange tongue, but muttered in a whisper the words by which he pretended to consecrate the bread and wine. Here our censurers have nothing to carp at, unless it be at our having simply followed the command of Christ. For he did not by a tacit exorcism command the bread to become his body, but with clear voice declared to his apostles that he gave them his body.

At the same time, as in the case of Baptism, so also in the case of the Lord's Supper, we explain to the people faithfully, and as carefully as we can, its end, efficacy, advantages, and use. First, we exhort all to come with faith, that by means of it they may inwardly discern the thing which is visibly represented, viz., the spiritual food by which alone their souls are nourished unto life eternal. We hold, that in this ordinance the Lord does not promise or figure by signs, any thing which he does not exhibit in reality; and we, therefore, preach that the body and blood of Christ are both offered to us by the Lord in the Supper, and received by us. Nor do we thus teach that the bread and wine are symbols, without immediately adding that there is a truth which is conjoined with them, and which they represent. We are not silent in proclaiming what, and how excellent the fruit is which thence redounds to us, and how noble the pledge of life and salvation which our consciences therein receive. None, indeed, who have any candour will deny, that with us this solemn ordinance is much more clearly explained, and its dignity more fully extolled, than is ever done elsewhere.

Digitized by Google

In the government of the Church we do not differ from others in anything for which we cannot give a most sufficient reason. The pastoral office we have restored, both according to the apostolic rule, and the practice of the primitive church, by insisting that every one who rules in the Church shall also teach. We hold that none are to be continued in the office but those who are diligent in performing its duties. In selecting them our advice has been, that more care and religion should be exercised, and we have ourselves studied so to act. It is well known what kind of examination bishops exercise by means of their suffragans or vicars, and we might even be able to conjecture what its nature is from the fruit which it produces. It is needless to observe how many lazy and good-for-nothing persons they every where promote to the honour of the priesthood. Among us, should some ministers be found of no great learning, still none is admitted who is not at least tolerably apt to teach. That all are not more perfect is to be imputed more to the calamity of the times than to us. This, however, is, and always will be, our just boast, that the ministers of our Church cannot seem to have been carelessly chosen if they are compared with others. But while we are superior in a considerable degree in the matter of trial and election, in this we particularly excel, that no man holds the pastoral office amongst us without executing its duties. Accordingly, none of our churches is seen without the ordinary preaching of the Word.

As it would shame our adversaries to deny these facts, (for in a matter so clear, what could they gain by the denial?) they quarrel with us, first, concerning the right and power, and, secondly, concerning the form of ordination. They quote ancient canons, which give the superintendence of this matter to the bishops and clergy. They allege a constant succession by which this right has been handed down to them, even from the apostles themselves. They deny that it can be lawfully transferred elsewhere. I wish they had, by their merit, retained a title to this boasted possession. But if we consider, first, the order in which for

Digitized by Google

several ages bishops have been advanced to this dignity, next, the manner in which they conduct themselves in it, and, lastly, the kind of persons whom they are accustomed to ordain, and to whom they commit the government of churches, we shall see that this succession on which they pride themselves was long ago interrupted. The ancient canons require, that he who is to be admitted to the office of bishop or presbyter, shall previously undergo a strict examination, both as to life and doctrine. Clear evidence of this is extant among the acts of the fourth African Council. Moreover, the magistracy and people had a discretionary power (*arbitrium*) of approving or refusing the individual who was nominated by the clergy, in order that no man might be intruded on the unwilling or not consenting. "Let him who is to preside over all," (says Leo, Ep. xc.,) "be elected by all; for he who is appointed, while unknown and unexamined, must of necessity be violently intruded." Again, (Ep. lxxxvii.,) "Let regard be had to the attestation of the honourable, the subscription of the clergy, and the consent of the magistracy and people. Reason permits not any other mode of procedure." Cyprian also contends for the very same thing, and, indeed, in stronger terms, affirming it as sanctioned by Divine authority, that the priest be elected in presence of the people, before the eyes of all, that he may be approved as fit and worthy by the testimony of all. This rule was in force for a short time while the state of the church was tolerable; for the letters of Gregory are full of passages which show that it was carefully observed in his day.

As the Holy Spirit in Scripture imposes on all bishops the necessity of teaching, so in the ancient church it would have been thought monstrous to nominate a bishop who should not, by teaching, demonstrate that he was a pastor also. Nor were they admitted to the office on any other condition. The same rule prevailed in regard to presbyters, each being set apart to a particular parish. Hence those decrees, "Let them not involve themselves in secular affairs, let them not make distant excursions from their churches, let them not be

Digitized by Google

long absent." Then it was enjoined by synodal decrees, that at the ordination of a bishop all the other bishops of the province should assemble, or if that could not be conveniently done, at least three should be present. And the object of this was, that no man might force an entrance by tumult, or creep in by stealth, or insinuate himself by indirect artifices. In the ordination of a presbyter, each bishop admitted a council of his own presbyters. These things, which might be narrated more fully, and confirmed more accurately in a set discourse, I here only mention in passing, because they afford an easy means of judging how much importance is due to this smoke of succession with which our bishops endeavour to blind us.

They maintain that Christ left as a heritage to the apostles, the sole right of appointing over churches whomsoever they pleased, and they complain that we, in exercising the ministry without their authority, have, with sacrilegious temerity, invaded their province. How do they prove it? Because they have succeeded the apostles in an unbroken series. But is this enough, when all other things are different? It would be ridiculous to say so; they do say it, however. In their elections, no account is taken either of life or doctrine. The right of voting had been wrested from the people. Nay, even excluding the rest of the clergy, the dignitaries have drawn the whole power to themselves. The Roman Pontiff, again, wresting it from the provincial Bishop, arrogates it to himself alone. Then, as if they had been appointed to secular dominion, there is nothing they less think of than episcopal duty. In short, while they seem to have entered into a conspiracy not to have any kind of resemblance either to the Apostles or the holy Fathers of the Church, they merely clothe themselves with the pretence that they are descended from them in an unbroken succession; as if Christ had ever enacted it into a law, that whatever might be the conduct of those who presided over the Church, they should be recognised as holding the place of the Apostles, or as if the office were some hereditary possession, which transmits alike to the worthy and the unworthy.

Digitized by Google

And then, as is said of the Milesians, they have taken precautions not to admit a single worthy person into their society; or if, perchance, they have unawares admitted him, they do not permit him to remain. It is of the generality I speak. For I deny not that there are a few good men among them, who, however, are either silent from fear, or not listened to. From those, then, who persecute the doctrine of Christ with fire and sword, who permit no man with impunity to speak sincerely of Christ, who, in every possible way, impede the course of truth, who strenuously resist our attempt to raise the Church from the distressed condition into which they have brought her, who suspect all those who take a deep and pious interest in the welfare of the Church, and either keep them out of the ministry, or, if they have been admitted, thrust them out—of such persons, forsooth, it were to be expected that they would, with their own hands, instal into the office faithful ministers to instruct the people in pure religion!

But, since the sentiment of Gregory has passed into a common proverb, that "those who abuse privilege deserve to lose privilege," they must either become entirely different from what they are, and select a different sort of persons to govern the Church, and adopt a different method of election, or they must cease to complain that they are improperly and injuriously despoiled of what in justice belonged to them. Or, if they would have me to speak more plainly, they must obtain their bishoprics by different means from those by which they have obtained them, they must ordain others to the office after a different way and manner; and if they wish to be recognised as bishops, they must fulfil their duty by feeding the people. If they would retain the power of nominating and ordaining, let them restore that just and serious examination of life and doctrine, which has for many ages been obsolete among them. But this one reason ought to be as good as a thousand, viz., that any man, who, by his conduct, shows that he is an enemy of sound doctrine, whatever title he may meanwhile boast, has lost all title to authority in the Church. We know what injunctions ancient councils

Digitized by Google

give concerning heretics, and what power they leave them. They certainly in express terms forbid any man to apply to them for ordination. No one, therefore, can lay claim to the right of ordaining, who does not, by purity of doctrine, preserve the unity of the Church. Now, we maintain that those who, in the present day, under the name of bishops, preside over churches, not only are not faithful ministers and guardians of sound doctrine, but rather its bitterest enemies. We maintain that their sole aim is, to banish Christ and the truth of his gospel, and sanction idolatry and impiety,—the most pernicious and deadly errors. We maintain that they, not only in word, pertinaciously impugn the true doctrine of godliness, but are infuriated against all who would rescue it from obscurity. Against the many impediments which they throw in the way, we studiously ply our labours in behalf of the Church, and for so doing, they expostulate with us as if we were making an illegal incursion into their province!

As to the form or ceremony of ordination, it is, forsooth, a mighty matter about which to molest us. Because with us the hands of priests are not anointed, because we do not blow into their face, because we do not clothe them in white and such-like attire, they think our ordination is not duly performed. But the only ceremony we read of, as used in ancient times, was the laying on of hands. Those other forms are recent, and have nought to recommend them but the exceeding scrupulosity with which they are now generally observed. But what is this to the point? In matters so important, a higher than human authority is required. Hence, as often as the circumstances of the times demand, we are at liberty to change such rites as men have invented without express sanction, while those of more recent introduction are still less to be regarded. They put a chalice and paten into the hands of those whom they ordain to be priests. Why? That they may inaugurate them for sacrificing. But by what command? Christ never conferred this function on the apostles, nor did he ever wish it to be undertaken by their successors. It is absurd, therefore, to molest us

Digitized by Google

about the form of ordination, in which we differ not either from the rule of Christ, or the practice of the apostles, or the custom of the ancient Church, whereas that form of theirs, which they accuse us of neglecting, they are not able to defend by the Word of God, by sound reason, or the pretext of antiquity.

On the subject of ecclesiastical regimen, there are laws of which we readily adopt such as are not snares for the conscience, or such as tend to the preservation of common order; but those which had either been tyrannically imposed to hold consciences in bondage, or were more subservient to superstition than to edification, we were forced to abrogate. Now, our enemies first charge us with fastidiousness and undue haste, and, secondly, accuse us of aiming at carnal indulgence, by shaking off the yoke of discipline, in order that we may wanton as we please. But, as I have already observed, we are by no means averse to the reverent observance of whatever rules are fitted to ensure that all things be done decently and in order, while, in regard to every single observance which we have abrogated, we refuse not to show cause why it behoved us so to do. Assuredly there is no difficulty in proving that the Church laboured exceedingly under a load of human traditions, and that it was necessary, if her interest were consulted, that this load should be lessened. There is a well known complaint by Augustine, wherein he deplores it as the calamity of his time, that the Church which God, in his mercy, wished to be free, was even then so overburdened, that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable, (*Epist.* 2, *ad Januarium.*) It is probable that since that period the number has increased almost tenfold. Much more has the rigorous exaction of them increased. What then, if that holy man were now to rise and behold the countless multitude of laws under which miserable consciences groan oppressed? What if, on the other hand, he were to see the strictness with which the observance of them is enforced? Our censurers will, perhaps, object that we might, with Augustine, have lamented over any thing which displeased

Digitized by Google

us, but that we ought not to have applied our hand to the work of correction. This objection is easily refuted. For, this pernicious error of supposing that human laws were necessary to be observed, required to be corrected. As I have said, we deny not that laws enacted with a view to external policy ought to be carefully obeyed, but in regard to the regulation of the conscience, we hold that there is no legislator but God. To Him alone, then, be reserved this authority, which He claims for himself in many passages of Scripture. In this matter, however, were subverted, first, the honour of God, from which it is impious to derogate in any degree, and, secondly, genuine liberty of conscience,—a liberty which, as Paul strenuously insists, must not be subjected to the will of men. As it was, therefore, our duty to deliver the consciences of the faithful from the undue bondage in which they were held, so we have taught that they are free and unfettered by human laws, and that this freedom, which was purchased by the blood of Christ, cannot be infringed. If any one thinks we are blameable in this, he must attribute the same blame to Christ and his Apostles. I do not yet enumerate the other evils which compelled us to set our face against human traditions. I will mention only two, and I am confident that, after I have mentioned them, all impartial readers will be satisfied. The one is, that as some of these traditions demanded things which it was impossible to perform, their only effect was to lead men to hypocrisy, or plunge them into despair; and the other, that all of them had practically realized what our Saviour rebuked in the Pharisees—they had made the commandments of God of none effect.

I will here adduce examples by which this will be made more clear.

There are three things, in particular, for which they are offended with us:—First, that we have given liberty to eat flesh on any day; secondly, that we have permitted marriage to priests; and, thirdly, that we have rejected the secret confession which was made in a priest's ear.

Digitized by Google

Let our opponents answer honestly. Is not the man who may have tasted flesh on Friday punished more severely than the man who may have spent the whole year in a constant course of lewdness? Is it not deemed a more capital offence in a priest to marry than to be caught a hundred times in adultery? Do they not pardon him who has contemned many of the divine precepts on easier terms than him who may have neglected once a-year to confess his sins into the ear of a priest? Is it not monstrous, I ask, that it should seem a slight and venial offence to violate the holy law of God, and that it should be judged an inexpiable crime to transgress the decrees of men? The case, I admit, is not without precedent. For, as I have already observed, the wickedness with which our Saviour charges the Pharisees is, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect through your tradition," (Matth. xv. 6.) Moreover, the arrogance of antichrist, of which Paul speaks, is, "That he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," (2 Thess. ii. 4.) For where is the incomparable majesty of God, after mortal man has been exalted to such a height that his laws take precedence of God's eternal decrees? I omit that an apostle describes the prohibitions of meats and of marriage as a doctrine of devils, (1 Tim. iv. 1–3.) That is surely bad enough; but the crowning impiety is to set man in a higher rank than God. If they deny the truth of my statement, I appeal to fact.

Then, what are those two laws of celibacy and auricular confession but dire murderers of souls? As all the ministers of their churches vow perpetual chastity, it becomes unlawful for them, ever after, from the terms in which the vow is conceived, to take wives. What, then, if one has not received the gift of continence? "There must be no exception here," is the answer. But experience shows how much better it would have been never to have imposed this yoke upon priests, than to shut them up in a furnace of lust, to burn with a perpetual flame. Our adversaries recount the praises of virginity; they recount also the ad-

Digitized by Google

vantages of celibacy, in order to prove that priests have not been rashly interdicted from marrying. They even talk of it as decent and honourable. But will they by all these things prove the lawfulness of fettering consciences which Christ not only left free and unfettered, but whose freedom he has vindicated by his own authority, and at the price of his own blood? Paul does not presume to do so, (1 Cor. vii. 35.) Whence, then, this new licence? Then, though virginity be extolled to the skies, what has this to do with the celibacy of priests, with whose obscenity the whole air is tainted? If the chastity which they profess in word they also exhibited in deed, then, perhaps, I might allow them to say that it is comely so to do. But when every man knows that the prohibition of marriage is only a licence to priests to commit gross sin, with what face, I ask, dare they make any mention of comeliness? As to those whose infamy is not notorious, that it may not be necessary for me to discuss the matter with them at length, I leave them to the tribunal of God, that they may there talk of their chastity.

It will be said that this law is imposed on none but those who vow spontaneously. But what greater necessity can be imagined than that by which they are forced to vow? The condition announced to all is, that none shall be admitted to the priesthood who has not previously, by vow, bound himself to perpetual celibacy, and that he who has vowed must be forced, even against his will, to perform what he has once undertaken—that no excuse for the contrary can be listened to. Still, they maintain that a celibacy so exacted is voluntary. But, while rhetoricians may be allowed to detail the disadvantages of marriage, and the advantages of celibacy, that, by declaiming on such topics in the schools they may improve their style, nothing they can say will prove the propriety of leading miserable consciences into a deadly snare, in which they must perpetually writhe till they are strangled. And the ridiculous part is, that, amidst all this flagitious turpitude, even hy-

Digitized by Google

pocrisy finds a place. For, whatever their conduct may be, they deem themselves better than others, for the simple reason that they have no wives.

The case is the same with confession. For they number up the advantages which follow from it. We, on the contrary, are equally prepared to point out not a few dangers which are justly to be dreaded, and to refer to numerous most grievous evils which have actually flowed from it. These, I say, are the kind of arguments which both parties may employ. But the perpetual rule of Christ, which cannot be changed or bent in this direction or in that; nay, which cannot, without impiety, be controverted, is, that conscience must not be brought into bondage. Besides, the law on which our opponents insist is one which can only torture souls, and ultimately destroy them. For it requires every individual to confess all his sins, once a-year, to his own priest; when this is not done, it leaves him no hope of obtaining pardon. It has been experimentally found by those who have made the trial seriously, that is, in the true fear of God, that it is not possible thus to confess even a hundredth part of our sins. The consequence was, that not having any mode of extricating themselves, they were driven to despair. Those, again, who desired to satisfy God in a more careless manner, found this confession a most complete cloak for hypocrisy. For, thinking that they obtained an acquittal at the bar of God as soon as they had disgorged their sins into the ear of a priest, they were bold to sin more freely, in consequence of the expeditious mode in which they were disburdened. Then, having in their minds a fixed persuasion that they fulfilled what the law enjoined, they thought that of whatever sort the enumeration might be, it comprehended all their sins, though, in point of fact, it did not embrace the thousandth part. See, then, on what ground our adversaries vociferate that we have destroyed the discipline of the Church,—simply because we have studied to succour miserable consciences when perishing under the pressure of a most cruel tyranny, and dragging hypocrites out of their lurking-places

Digitized by Google

into open day, that they might both examine themselves more closely, and begin to have a better idea of the Divine justice, which they formerly evaded.

But some one will say, that however numerous the abuses, and however deserving of correction, still laws, in other respects sacred and useful, and in a manner consecrated by a high antiquity, ought not to have been thus abolished instantly and altogether.

In regard to the eating of flesh, my simple answer is, that the doctrine we hold accords with that of the ancient Church, in which we know that it was free to eat flesh at all times, or to abstain from it.

The prohibition of the marriage of priests I admit to be ancient, as is also the vow of perpetual continence, taken by nuns and monks. But if they concede that the declared will of God outweighs human custom, why, when perfectly aware that the will of God is with us, and clearly supports our view, do they seek to quarrel with us about antiquity? The doctrine is clear, "Marriage is honourable in all," (Heb. xiii. 4.) Paul expressly speaks of Bishops as husbands, (1 Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 6.) As a general rule, he enjoins marriage on all of a particular temperament, and classes the interdiction of marriage among the "doctrines of devils," (1 Tim. iv. 3.) What avails it to set human custom in opposition to the clear declarations of the Holy Spirit, unless men are to be preferred to God? And it is of importance to observe how unfair judges they are, who, in this matter, allege against us the practice of the ancient Church. Is there any antiquity of the Church, either earlier, or of higher authority, than the days of the Apostles? But our opponents will not deny, that at that time marriage was permitted to all the ministers of the Church, and used by them. If the Apostles were of opinion that priests ought to be restrained from marrying, why did they defraud the Church of so great a boon? Yet, after them, about two hundred and fifty years elapsed, until the Council of Nice, when, as Sozomen relates, the question of enjoining celibacy on ministers was agitated, but by the inter-

Digitized by Google

ference of Paphnutius, the whole affair went off. For it is related, that after he, being himself a bachelor, had declared that a law of celibacy was not to be tolerated, the whole council readily assented to this opinion. But superstition gradually increasing, the law, which was then repudiated, was at length enacted. Among those Canons, which, as well from their antiquity, as the uncertainty of their author, bear the name of Apostolical, there is one which does not permit any clerical persons, except singers and readers, to marry, after they have been admitted to office. But by a previous Canon, priests and deacons are prohibited from putting away their wives under the pretext of religion. And in the fourth Canon of the Council of Gangra, anathema is pronounced against those who made a difference between a married and an unmarried clergyman, so as to absent themselves when he officiated. Hence it appears that there was still in those times considerably more equity than a subsequent age manifested.

Here, however, it was not my intention to discuss this subject fully. I only thought it proper to indicate in passing, that the primitive and purer Church is not in this matter so adverse to us as our enemies pretend. But grant that it is, why do they accuse us as fiercely as if we were confounding things sacred and profane, or as if we could not easily retort against them, that we accord far better with the ancient Church than they do? Marriage, which the ancients denied to priests, we allow! What do they say to the licentiousness which has everywhere obtained among them? They will deny that they approve it. But if they were desirous to obey the ancient Canons, it would become them to chastise it more severely. The punishment which the Council of Neo-Cesarea inflicts on a presbyter who married was deposition, while one guilty of adultery or fornication it punishes far more severely, adding to deposition excommunication also. In the present day, the marriage of a priest is deemed a capital crime, while for his hundred acts of whoredom he is mulcted in a small sum of money. Doubtless, if those who first passed the law of

Digitized by Google

celibacy were now alive, instructed by present experience, they would be the first to abrogate it. However, as I have already said, it would be the height of injustice to condemn us on the authority of men, in a matter in which we are openly acquitted by the voice of God.

With regard to confession, we have a briefer and readier defence. Our opponents cannot show that the necessity of confessing was imposed earlier than Innocent III. For twelve hundred years this tyranny, for which they contend with us so keenly, was unknown to the Christian world. But there is a decree of the Lateran Council! True! but of the same description as many others. Those who have any tolerable knowledge of history are aware of the equal ignorance and ferocity of those times. This, indeed, is in accordance with the common observation, that the most ignorant governors are always the most imperious. But all pious souls will bear me witness, in what a maze those must be entangled who think themselves obliged by that law. To this cruel torturing of consciences has been added the blasphemous presumption of making it essential to the remission of sin. For they pretend that none obtain pardon from God but those who are disposed to confess. What is this, pray, but for men to prescribe at their own hand the mode in which a sinner is reconciled to God—God offering pardon simply, while they withhold it until a condition which they have added shall have been fulfilled? On the other hand, the people were possessed with this most pernicious superstition, viz., that as soon as they had disburdened themselves of their sins, by pouring them into the ear of a priest, they were completely freed from guilt. This opinion many abused to a more unrestrained indulgence in sin, while even those who were more influenced by the fear of God paid greater regard to the priest than to Christ. That public and solemn acknowledgment, (exomologesis, as Cyprian calls it,) which penitents were anciently obliged to make when they were to be reconciled to the Church, there is no sane man who does not commend and willingly adopt, provided it be not stretched to

Digitized by Google

some other end than that for which it was instituted. In short, we have no controversy in this matter with the ancient Church; we only wish, as we ought, to rid the necks of believers of a modern tyranny of recent date. Besides, when any person, in order to obtain consolation and counsel, visits his minister in private, and familiarly deposits in his breast the causes of his anxiety, we by no means object, provided it is done freely, and not of constraint. Let every man, I say, be left at liberty to do in this matter what he feels to be expedient for himself; let no man's conscience be tied down by fixed laws.

I hope your Imperial Majesty, and you, Most Illustrious Princes, will be satisfied with this apology. It is certainly just.

But how deservedly soever we complain that the doctrine of truth was corrupted, and the whole body of Christianity sullied by numerous blemishes, still our censurers deny that this was cause sufficient for so disturbing the Church, and, in a manner, convulsing the whole world.

We, indeed, are not so stupid as not to perceive how desirable it is to avoid public tumults, nor so savage as not to be touched, and even to shudder in our inmost soul, on beholding the troubled condition in which the Church now is. But with what fairness is the blame of existing commotions imputed to us, when they have not been, in the least degree, excited by us? Nay, with what face is the crime of disturbing the Church laid to our charge by the very persons who obviously are the authors of all these disturbances? This is just the case of the wolves complaining of the lambs.

When Luther at first appeared, he merely touched, with a gentle hand, a few abuses of the grossest description, now grown intolerable. And he did it with a modesty which intimated that he had more desire to see them corrected, than determination to correct them himself. The opposite party forthwith sounded to arms; and when the contention was more and more inflamed, our enemies deemed it the

Digitized by Google

best and shortest method to suppress the truth by cruelty and violence. Accordingly, when our people challenged them to friendly discussion, and desired to settle disputes by calm arguments, they were cruelly persecuted with sanguinary edicts, until matters have been brought to the present miserable pass.

Nor is this calumny against us without precedent. With the very same charge which we are now forced to hear, wicked Ahab once upbraided Elijah, viz., that he was the disturber of Israel. But the holy Prophet by his reply acquitted us; "I," says he, "have not troubled Israel, but thou and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim," (1 Kings xviii. 17, 18.) It is unfair, therefore, to load us with odium, on account of the fierce contest concerning religion which this day rages in Christendom, unless, indeed, it be thought proper first to condemn Elijah, with whom we have a common defence. His sole excuse is, that he had fought only to vindicate the glory and restore the pure worship of God, and he retorts the charge of exciting contention and disturbances upon those who stirred up tumults as a means of resisting the truth. And what is it that we have done hitherto, and what do we even now, but strive that the one God may be worshipped amongst us, and that his simple truth may reign in the Church? If our adversaries deny this, let them, at least, convict us of impious doctrine before they charge it upon us, as a fault, that we dissent from others. For what were we to do? The only terms on which we could purchase peace were to betray the truth of God by silence. Though, indeed, it would not have been enough to be silent, unless we had also, by tacit consent, approved of impious doctrine, of open blasphemies against God, and the most degrading superstitions. What else, then, at the very least, could we do, than testify with a clear voice that we had no fellowship with impiety? We have, therefore, simply studied to do what was our duty. That matters have blazed forth into such hostile strife is an evil, the blame of which must rest

Digitized by Google

with those who chose to confound heaven and earth, rather than give a place to pious and sound doctrine—their object being, by whatever means, to keep possession of the tyranny which they had usurped.

It ought to be sufficient, and more than sufficient, for our defence, that the sacred truth of God, in asserting which we sustain so many contests, is on our side, whereas our adversaries, in contending with us, war not so much against us as God himself. Then it is not of our own accord that we engage in this fervour of contention. It is their intemperance which has dragged us into it against our expectation. Let the result, then, have been what it may, there is no reason why we should be loaded with hatred. For as it is not ours to govern events, neither is it ours to prevent them. But there is an ancient practice which the wicked have resorted to in all ages, viz., to take occasion from the preaching of the gospel to excite tumult, and then to defame the gospel as the cause of dissension—dissension which, even in the absence of opportunity, they wickedly and eagerly court. And, as in the primitive Church, the prophecy behoved to be fulfilled, that Christ should be to his own countrymen a stone of stumbling and rock of offence, so it is not surprising if the same thing holds true in our time also. It may well indeed be thought strange for the builders to reject the stone which ought to occupy the principal place in the foundation, but as this happened at the beginning, in the case of Christ, let it not surprise us that it is also a common event in the present day. Here I entreat your Imperial Majesty, and you, Most Illustrious Princes, that as oft as this unhappy rending of the Church, and the other countless evils which have sprung from dissension, either occur to your own thoughts, or are suggested by others, you would, at the same time, call to mind, that Christ has been set up as a sign to be spoken against, and that his gospel, wherever it is preached, instantly inflames the rage and resistance of the wicked. Then, from conflict a shock must necessarily ensue. Hence the uniform fate of the gospel, from its first commencement, has been,

Digitized by Google

and always will be, even unto the end, to be preached in the world amid great contention. But it is the part of the prudent to consider from what source the evil springs. Whoever does this will readily free us from all blame. It certainly behoved us to bear testimony to the truth, as we have done. Woe to the world if it chooses to challenge Christ to combat, rather than embrace the peace which He offers! The man who will not bear to be corrected will undoubtedly be crushed by Him.

But here again it is objected, that all the corruptions of the Church are not to be corrected by such harsh remedies—that they are not to be cut in to the quick—that not even is medicine to be applied to all, but some are to be treated gently, and others submitted to, if they cannot without difficulty be removed. I answer, that we are not so unacquainted with ordinary life as not to know that the Church always has been, and always will be, liable to some defects which the pious are indeed bound to disapprove, but which are to be borne rather than be made a cause of fierce contention. But our adversaries are unjust when they accuse us of being excessively morose, as if we had brought the Church into trouble on account of small and trivial errors. For to their other misrepresentations they add this one also, of endeavouring, by every artifice in their power, to extenuate the importance of the things which we have made the subject of controversy; the object being to make it seem that we have been hurried on by a love of quarrelling, and not that we were drawn into it by a just cause. This they do, not in ignorance, but with cunning design, namely, because they know that there is nothing more odious than the rash haste which they impute to us. And yet they, at the same time, betray their own impiety in speaking so contemptuously of matters of the greatest moment. And is it indeed so, that when we complain that the worship of God was profaned—that His honour was utterly impaired—that the doctrine of salvation was entangled with numerous destructive errors—that the virtue of Christ's death was suppressed—and that, in short, all things sacred were sacrilegiously polluted; is it indeed so,

Digitized by Google

that we are to be derided and charged with the folly of disturbing ourselves and the whole world besides, to no purpose, with disputes about insignificant questions?

But as a cursory glance at these things is not sufficient, it will now be necessary more diligently to explain to you the dignity and importance of the points in dispute, so as to make it manifest, not only that they were not unworthy of notice, but that we could not possibly overlook them without involving ourselves in the greatest guilt, and becoming chargeable with impious perfidy towards God. This is the third of the three heads, of which at the outset I proposed to treat.

First, then, I wish to know, with what face they can call themselves Christians, when they charge us with rashly disturbing the Church with disputes about matters of no importance. For, if they set as much value on our religion as the ancient idolaters did on their superstitions, they would not speak so contemptuously of zeal for its preservation, but, in imitation of idolaters, would give it the precedence of all other cares and business. For, when idolaters spoke of fighting for their altars and their hearths, they alleged what they believed to be the best and strongest of all causes. Our opponents, on the contrary, regard as almost superfluous a contest which is undertaken for the glory of God and the salvation of men. For it is not true, as has been alleged, that we dispute about a worthless shadow. The whole substance of the Christian religion is brought into question. Were nothing else involved, is the eternal and inviolable truth of God, that truth to which he rendered so many illustrious testimonies, in confirming which so many holy prophets and so many martyrs met their death, truth heralded and witnessed by the Son of God himself, and ultimately sealed with his blood, is that truth of so little value, that it may be trampled under foot, while we look on and are silent?

But I descend to particulars. We know how execrable a thing idolatry is in the sight of God, and history abounds with narratives of the dreadful punishments with which He visited it, both in the Israelitish people and in other nations. From his own mouth, we hear the same vengeance denounced against all ages. For to us he speaks when he swears by

Digitized by Google

his holy name, that he will not suffer his glory to be transferred to idols, and when he declares that he is a jealous God, taking vengeance, to the third and fourth generation, upon all sins, and more especially on this one. This is the sin on account of which Moses, who was otherwise of so meek a temper, being inflamed by the Spirit of God, ordered the Levites "to go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour," (Exod. xxxii. 27;) the sin on account of which God so often punished his chosen people, afflicting them with sword, pestilence, and famine, and, in short, all kinds of calamity; the sin on account of which, especially, the kingdom, first of Israel, and then of Judah, was laid waste, Jerusalem the holy city destroyed, the temple of God (the only temple then existing in the world) laid in ruins, and the people whom he had selected out of all the nations of the earth to be peculiarly his own, entering into covenant with them, that they alone might bear his standard, and live under his rule and protection—the people, in short, from whom Christ was to spring, were doomed to all kinds of disaster, stript of all dignity, driven into exile, and brought to the brink of destruction. It were too long here to give a full detail, for there is not a page in the Prophets which does not proclaim aloud that there is nothing which more provokes the divine indignation. What then? When we saw idolatry openly and everywhere stalking abroad, were we to connive at it? To have done so would have just been to rock the world in its sleep of death, that it might not awake.

Be pleased, Most Invincible Cæsar, and Most Illustrious Princes, to call to mind the many corruptions by which, as I have already shown, the worship of God was polluted, and you will assuredly find that impiety had broken out like a deluge, under which religion was completely submerged. Hence, divine honours were paid to images, and prayers everywhere offered to them, under the pretence that the power and deity of God resided in them. Hence, too, dead saints were worshipped exactly in the manner in which of

Digitized by Google

old the Israelites worshipped Baalim. And by the artifice of Satan, numerous other modes had been devised by which the glory of God was torn to pieces. The Lord exclaims, that he burns with jealousy when any idol is erected, and Paul demonstrates, by his own example, that His servants should be zealous in asserting His glory, (Acts xvii. 16.) It is no common zeal for the house of God which ought to penetrate and engross the hearts of believers. When, therefore, the Divine glory was polluted, or rather lacerated, in so many ways, would it not have been perfidy if we had winked or been silent? A dog, seeing any violence offered to his master, will instantly bark; could we, in silence, see the sacred name of God dishonoured so blasphemously? In such a case, how could it have been said, "The reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me?" (Psal. lxix. 9.)

The mockery which worships God with nought but external gestures and absurd human fictions, how could we, without sin, allow to pass unrebuked? We know how much he hates hypocrisy, and yet in that fictitious worship, which was everywhere in use, hypocrisy reigned. We hear how bitter the terms in which the Prophets inveigh against all worship fabricated by human rashness. But a good intention, *i.e.*, an insane licence of daring whatever man pleased, was deemed the perfection of worship. For it is certain that in the whole body of worship which had been established, there was scarcely a single observance which had an authoritative sanction from the Word of God. We are not in this matter to stand either by our own or by other men's judgments. We must listen to the voice of God, and hear in what estimation he holds that profanation of worship which is displayed when men, overleaping the boundaries of His Word, run riot in their own inventions. The reasons which he assigns for punishing the Israelites with blindness, after they had lost the pious and holy discipline of the Church, are two, viz., the prevalence of hypocrisy, and *will-worship*, (ἐθελοθρησκειαν,) meaning thereby a form of worship contrived by man. "Forasmuch," saith he, "as the people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have re-

Digitized by Google

moved their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; therefore I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid," (Isa. xxix. 13, 14.) When God stirred us up, a similar or worse perversity openly domineered throughout the Church. While God, then, was thundering from heaven, were we to sit quiet?

Perhaps they will consider as a trivial error the custom which prevailed, in defiance of the clear prohibition of God, of repeating the public prayers in an unknown tongue. But since it is manifest that by such procedure God was mocked, they cannot deny that we had too good cause to object to it. Then, what shall I say of the blasphemies which rung in the public hymns, and which no pious man is able to hear without the utmost horror? We all know the epithets which they applied to Mary—styling her the gate of heaven, hope, life, and salvation; and to such a degree of infatuation and madness had they proceeded, that they even gave her a right to order Christ! For still in many churches is heard the execrable and impious stanza, "Ask the Father; command the Son." In terms in no respect more modest do they celebrate certain of the saints, and these, too, saints of their own making, *i.e.*, individuals whom they, on their own judgment, have admitted into the catalogue of saints. For, among the multitude of praises which they sing to Claud, they call him "the light of the blind," "the guide of the erring," "the life and resurrection of the dead." The forms of prayer in daily use are stuffed with similar blasphemies. The Lord denounces the severest threatenings against those who, either in oaths or in prayers, confounded his name with Baalim. What vengeance, then, impends over our heads when we not only confound him with saints as minor gods, but with signal insult rob Christ of the proper and peculiar titles with which he is distinguished, in order that we may bestow them on creatures? Were we to be silent here, also, and by perfidious silence call down on ourselves his heavy judgments?

Digitized by Google

I say nothing of the fact that no man prayed, and that indeed no man could pray, to God with firm faith, *i.e.*, in good earnest. For Christ being, in a manner, buried, the necessary consequence was, that men were always in doubt whether God had a Father's kindness toward them—whether he was disposed to assist them—and whether he took any interest in their salvation. What! was it an error either trivial or tolerable, when the eternal priesthood of Christ, as if it had been set up to be preyed upon, was bestowed, without distinction, on any individual among the saints? Let us remember that Christ, by his death, purchased for himself the honour of being the eternal advocate and peace-maker to present our prayers and our persons to the Father; to obtain supplies of grace for us, and enable us to hope we shall obtain what we ask. As he alone died for us, and redeemed us by his death, so he admits of no partnership in this honour. Therefore, what fouler blasphemy than that which is ever and anon in the mouths of our opponents, viz., that Christ is indeed the only mediator of redemption, but that all the saints are mediators of intercession? Is not Christ in this way left inglorious? as if, after having once in his death performed the office of priest, he had ever after resigned it to the saints. Are we, then, to be silent when the peculiar dignity of Christ, the dignity which cost him such a price, is wrested from him with the greatest contumely, and distributed among the saints, as if it were lawful spoil? But it seems that when they speak thus they do not deny that Christ intercedes for us even now; only we are to understand that he does it along with the saints, *i.e.*, just as any other one in the catalogue. It must have been a mighty honour which Christ purchased for himself by his blood, if all he obtained was to be the associate of Hugo, Lubin, or some of the merest dregs of saintship which the Roman Pontiff has conferred at his own pleasure. For the question is not, whether the saints even do pray, (this being a subject of which it is better to have no knowledge, as Scripture does not mention it,) but the question is, whether, after passing by Christ, or treating him with neglect, or positively abandoning him altogether, we are en-

Digitized by Google

titled to look round for the patronage of saints; or, if they will have it in plainer terms, whether Christ is the only priest who opens up an asylum for us in heaven, leads us thither by the hand, and, by his intercession, inclines the Father to listen to our prayers, so that we ought to cast ourselves entirely on his advocacy, and present our prayers in his name; or whether, on the contrary, he holds this office in common with the saints?

I have shown above that Christ was in a great measure defrauded, not of the honour of the priesthood merely, but also of the gratitude due for his benefits. True, he is called a Redeemer, but in a manner which implies that men also, by their own free will, redeem themselves from the bondage of sin and death. True, he is called righteousness and salvation, but so that men still procure salvation for themselves, by the merit of their works; for this inestimable gift, which no eloquence of men or angels is able adequately to describe, the schoolmen are not ashamed to restrict, telling us that though he confers the first merit, *i. e.*, as they explain it, the occasion of meriting, yet after receiving this help, we merit eternal life by our own works. True, they confess that we are washed from our sins by the blood of Christ, but so that every individual cleanses himself by washings elsewhere obtained. True, the death of Christ receives the name of a sacrifice, but so that sins are expiated by the daily sacrifices of men. True, Christ is said to have reconciled us to the Father, but with this reservation, that men, by their own satisfactions, buy off the punishments which they owe to the justice of God. When supplementary aid is sought from the benefit of the keys, no more honour is paid to Christ than to Cyprian or Cyricius. For, in making up the treasury of the Church, the merits of Christ and of martyrs are thrown together in the slump.

In all these things, have we not just as many execrable blasphemies as we have words, blasphemies by which the glory of Christ is rent, and torn to shreds? For, being in a great measure despoiled of his honour, he retains the name, while he wants the power. Here, too, no doubt, we might

Digitized by Google

have been silent, though we saw the Son, on whom the Father hath bestowed all authority, and power, and glory, and in whom alone he bids us glory, so classified with his servants, that he had scarcely any pre-eminence above them. When we saw his benefits thus in oblivion—when we saw his virtue destroyed by the ingratitude of men—when we saw the price of his blood held in no estimation, and the fruits of his death almost annihilated—when, in fine, we saw him so deformed by false and profane opinions, that he had more resemblance to an unsubstantial phantom than to himself, did it behove us to bear it calmly and silently? O accursed patience, if, when the honour of God is impaired, not to say prostrated, we are so slightly affected, that we can wink and pass on! O ill-bestowed benefits of Christ, if we can permit the memory of them to be thus suppressed by impious blasphemies!

I again return to the second branch of Christian doctrine. Who can deny that men are labouring under a kind of delirium, when they suppose that they procure eternal life by the merit of their works? I admit that they conjoin the grace of God with their works, but in as much as their confidence of obtaining acceptance is made to depend on their own worthiness, it is clear that the ground of their confidence and boasting lies in their works. The trite and favourite doctrine of the schools, the opinion deeply seated in almost all minds, is—that every individual is loved by God in exact proportion to his deserts. Entertaining this view, are not souls, by means of a confidence which the devil inspires, raised to a height, from which, as from a loftier precipice, they are afterwards plunged into the gulf of despair? Again, when they pretend to merit the favour of God, it is not merely by true obedience, but by frivolous observances, of no value. The meritorious works to which the first place is assigned are these—to mumble over a multitude of little prayers, to erect altars, and place statues or pictures thereon —to frequent churches, and run up and down from one church to another—to hear many masses, and to buy some—

Digitized by Google

to wear out their bodies, by I know not what abstinences—abstinences having nothing in common with Christian fasting; and, in particular, to be most careful in observing the traditions of men. In the matter of satisfactions, is it not even a greater infatuation which makes them, after the manner of the heathen, set out in quest of expiations, by which they may reconcile themselves to God? After all these attempts, after great and long fatigue, what did they gain? Doing every thing with a dubious and trembling conscience, they were always exposed to that fearful anxiety, or rather that dire torment, of which I have already spoken, because they were enjoined to doubt whether their persons and their works were not hateful to God. Confidence being in this way overthrown, the necessary consequence was, as Paul declares, that the promise of the eternal inheritance was made void. In such circumstances, what became of the salvation of men? Where there was such necessity for speaking, had we kept silence, we should have been not only ungrateful and treacherous towards God, but also cruel towards men, over whom we saw eternal destruction impending, unless they were brought back into the proper path.

Were a dog to see an injury offered to his master, equal to the insult which is offered to God in the sacraments, he would instantly bark, and expose his own life to danger, sooner than silently allow his master to be so insulted. Ought we to show less devotedness to God than a brute is wont to show to man? I say nothing of the fact that rites, founded merely on human authority, have been put on a footing with the mysteries instituted by Christ, and recommended by his Divine authority, though the procedure is deserving of the severest rebuke. But when the mysteries themselves were thus corrupted, by the many superstitions, and dishonoured by the many false opinions, to which we have already adverted, for base and filthy lucre, ought we to have dissembled and borne it, or pretended not to see? Christ with a whip drove the money-changers out of the temple, threw down their tables, and scattered their merchandise. I admit it is not lawful for every man to take the

Digitized by Google

whip into his own hand, but it is incumbent on all who professedly belong to Christ to burn with the zeal with which Christ was animated, when he vindicated the glory of his Father. Therefore, that profanation of the temple, at which he, in a manner so marked, expressed his strong displeasure, it is at least our part to condemn, in a free, firm, and decided tone. Who is ignorant that sacraments have now for a long time been sold in churches, as openly as the wares which stand exposed in the public market? Other rites, too, have their fixed price, while as to some a bargain is not struck till after long higgling.

But since the instances which are exhibited in the Lord's Supper are manifest, and of a nature more heinous than in the case of other rites, come and say with what conscience could we have connived at profanations of it, at once so numerous and so blasphemous? Seeing that even now I want words to express them, with what justice are we charged with excessive vehemence in inveighing against them? By the sacred body of Christ, which hung in sacrifice for us, by the holy blood which he shed for our ablution, I here beseech your Imperial Majesty, and you, Most Illustrious Princes, that you will be pleased seriously to consider how great must be the mystery in which that body is set before us for meat, and that blood for drink; to consider how carefully, how religiously, it ought to be kept unpolluted. What ingratitude, then, must it be when this heavenly mystery, which Christ has committed to us like a most precious jewel, is trodden under feet of swine, for any man to look on, and be silent? But we may see it not only trodden, but also defiled by every species of pollution. What an insult was offered, when the efficacy of Christ's death was transferred to a theatrical performance by men—when some priestling, as if he had been the successor of Christ, interposed himself as a Mediator between God and man—when, after destroying the virtue of the only sacrifice, a thousand sacrifices of expiation were daily offered in a single city—when Christ was sacrificed a thousand times a-day, as if he had not done enough in once dying for us? In heaping all these insults

Digitized by Google

upon Christ, they abused the character of the Holy Supper; for they are all included in this single notion of sacrifice. I am not ignorant of the glosses which our opponents employ, in order to screen their absurdities. Up to the present age, they impudently practised all the abominations to which I have referred; but being now detected, they burrow in new holes, without being able, however, to hide their turpitude. They taught that the mass was a sacrifice, by which the sins not only of the living, but also of the dead, were expiated. What do they now gain by quibbling, except it be to betray their impudence? How deeply, too, is the sacrament polluted, when, instead of the open preaching of the Word, which constitutes its legitimate consecration, a charm is wrought with the bread by means of whiffs and whispers? When, instead of being distributed among the assembly of the faithful, it is devoured apart by one man, or set aside for another's use? And when, even in the case where a kind of distribution is made, the people are, in defiance of the clear injunction of our Lord, defrauded of the half, I mean the cup? What delirium to fancy that by their exercises the substance of bread is transmuted into Christ? How shameful to see a trade in masses plied as unblushingly as a trade in shoes! For if it is true, as they say, that the thing they vend is the merit of Christ's death, the insult which they offer to Christ is not less gross than if they spat in his face.

Be pleased, Most Invincible Emperor, and Most Illustrious Princes, to call to mind the disaster which of old befel the Corinthians on account of one, and that not at first sight, so very heinous an abuse of this sacrament. Each brought from home his own supper, not as a common contribution, but that the rich might feast luxuriantly while the poor hungered. For this cause the Lord chastised them with a severe and deadly pestilence. Such is the account of Paul, who, at the same time, bids us regard it as a paternal rod, by which the Lord called them to repentance. From this infer what we have at this day to expect, who have not declined merely in some little iota

Digitized by Google

from the genuine institution of Christ, but wandered to an immeasurable distance from it; who have not only corrupted its purity in one instance, but defaced it in numerous instances, and these, too, of a shocking description; who have not merely interfered with its legitimate end, by some single abuse, but perverted its whole administration. Nor can it be doubted, that now, for some time, God has begun to avenge this impiety. Now, for many years in succession, the world has been pressed by numerous varying troubles and calamities, until it has at length arrived at almost the extreme of wretchedness. We, indeed, stand amazed at our disasters, or suggest other reasons why God so afflicts us. But if we reflect how slight the error by which the Corinthians had vitiated the sacred Supper was, if contrasted with all the defilements by which, in the present day, it is sullied and polluted amongst ourselves, it is strange not to perceive that God, who so severely punished them, is justly more offended with us.

Were I to follow out all the flagitious corruptions of ecclesiastical government, I should enter an interminable forest. Of the lives of the priests, for many reasons, I at present decline to speak; but there are three vices of an intolerable description, on which each individual may reflect for himself: *First*, Disregarding the character of a holy vocation, clerical offices are everywhere acquired either by violence or by simony, or by other dishonest and impious arts: *Secondly*, The rulers of the Church, in so far as regards the performance of their duties, are more like empty shadows or lifeless images than true ministers; and, *Thirdly*, When they ought to govern consciences in accordance with the Word of God, they oppress them with an iniquitous tyranny, and hold them in bondage by the fetters of many impious laws. Is it true, that, not only in contempt of the laws of God and man, but in the absence of everything like a sense of shame, foul disorder reigns in the appointment of Bishops and Presbyters? that caprice assumes the place of justice, simony is seldom absent, and, as if these were evils of no consequence, the correction of

Digitized by Google

them is deferred to a future age? What is become of the duty of teaching—the proper characteristic of the ministry? As to true liberty of conscience, we know how many struggles Paul engaged in, and how earnestly he contended in its defence; but every person who judges impartially must certainly perceive, that at the present time we have much more cause to contend for it. In a corruption of sound doctrine so extreme, in a pollution of the sacraments so nefarious, in a condition of the Church so deplorable, those who maintain that we ought not to have felt so strongly, would have been satisfied with nothing less than a perfidious tolerance, by which we should have betrayed the worship of God, the glory of Christ, the salvation of men, the entire administration of the sacraments, and the government of the Church. There is something specious in the name of moderation, and tolerance is a quality which has a fair appearance, and seems worthy of praise; but the rule which we must observe at all hazards is, never to endure patiently that the sacred name of God should be assailed with impious blasphemy—that his eternal truth should be suppressed by the devil's lies—that Christ should be insulted, his holy mysteries polluted, unhappy souls cruelly murdered, and the Church left to writhe in extremity under the effect of a deadly wound. This would be not meekness, but indifference about things to which all others ought to be postponed.

I trust I have now clearly shown, as I proposed, that in correcting the corruption of the Church, we have by no means been more urgent than the case demanded. Even those who blame us are aware of this, and, accordingly, they have recourse to another charge, viz., that the utmost we have gained by our interference has been to fill the Christian world, which was formerly at peace, with intestine discord—that so far from any amendment appearing, things have gone on to worse—that of those who have embraced our doctrine few have been made better, nay, that some have been emboldened, if not to greater, at least to

Digitized by Google

more unrestrained licentiousness. They object, moreover, that in our churches there is no discipline, no laws of abstinence, no exercises of humility; that the people, thrown loose from the yoke, riot with impunity in vicious courses. Lastly, they throw upon us the odium of seizing on the property of ecclesiastics, asserting that our princes have made a rush upon it as if it had been lawful spoil; that in this way the Church has been violently and shamefully plundered, and that now the patrimony of the Church is possessed indiscriminately by those who, amid the uproar of contention, have usurped it without law or any proper title.

I, for my part, deny not that when impiety reigned, her kingdom was disturbed by us. But if, at the moment when the light of sound and pious doctrine beamed upon the world, all, as in duty bound, had spontaneously, and with ready mind, lent their aid, there would at the present day be no less peace and quietness in all the churches, (the kingdom of Christ flourishing,) than in the days when Antichrist tyrannised. Let those who, it is manifest, impede the course of truth, desist from waging war with Christ, and there will instantly be perfect concord; or let them desist from throwing upon us the blame of dissensions, which they themselves excite. For it is certainly most unfair, while they refuse all terms of peace unless Antichrist be permitted, after putting the doctrine of piety to flight, and as it were again consigning Christ to the tomb, to subjugate the Church; it is most unfair not only to boast as if they themselves were innocent, but also to insult over us; and that we, who desire nothing else than unity, and whose only bond of union is the eternal truth of God, should bear all the blame and odium, as much as if we were the authors of dissension. In regard to the allegation, that no fruit has been produced by our doctrine, I am well aware that profane men deride us, and allege that in probing sores which are incurable, we only enlarge the ulcer. For their opinion is, that the desperate condition of the Church makes it vain to attempt remedies, there being no hope of cure;

Digitized by Google

and they hence conclude that the best course is not to meddle with an evil well fixed. Those who speak in this way understand not that the restoratiou of the Church is the work of God, and no more depends on the hopes and opinions of men, than the resurrection of the dead, or any other miracle of that description. Here, therefore, we are not to wait for facility of action, either from the will of men, or the temper of the times, but must rush forward through the midst of despair. It is the will of our Master that his gospel be preached. Let us obey his command, and follow whithersoever he calls. What the success will be it is not ours to inquire. Our only duty is to wish for what is best, and beseech it of the Lord in prayer; to strive with all zeal, solicitude, and diligence, to bring about the desired result, and, at the same time, to submit with patience to whatever that result may be.

Groundless, therefore, is the charge brought against us of not having done all the good which we wished, and which was to be desired. God bids us plant and water. We have done so. He alone gives the increase. What, then, if he chooses not to give according to our wish? If it is clear that we have faithfully done our part, let not our adversaries require more of us: if the result is unfavourable, let them expostulate with God. But the pretence that no benefit has resulted from our doctrine is most false. I say nothing of the correction of external idolatry, and of numerous superstitions and errors; though that is not to be counted of no moment. But is there no fruit in this, that many who are truly pious feel their obligation to us, in that they have at length learned to worship God with a pure heart, and to invoke him with a calm conscience, have been freed from perpetual torments, and furnished with true delight in Christ, so as to be able to confide in him? But if we are asked for proofs which every eye can see, it has not fared so unhappily with us that we cannot point to numerous sources of rejoicing. How many who formerly led a vicious course of life have been so reformed as to seem converted into new men? How many whose past lives

Digitized by Google

had been free from censure, nay, who were held in the highest estimation, have, instead of retrograding, been able to testify by their conduct that our ministry has proved neither barren nor unfruitful? Our enemies, no doubt, have it in their power to traduce and lacerate us by their calumnies, especially among the ignorant; but this they can never wrest from us, viz., that in those who have embraced our doctrine, greater innocence, integrity, and true holiness, are found, than in all who among them are deemed of greatest excellence. But if there are any (and we confess the number is but too great) who pervert the gospel, by giving loose reins to their passions, the circumstance, assuredly, is not new; and if it was, how can we be made to bear the blame of it? It is admitted that the gospel is the only rule of a good and holy life; but in the fact that all do not allow themselves to be ruled by it, and that some, as if set free from restraint, even sin more presumptuously, we recognise the truth of Simeon's saying, that Christ "is set up, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed," (Luke ii. 35.) If God sees meet to kindle the light of the gospel, in order that the hidden iniquity of the wicked may be exposed, out of this to concoct a charge against the ministers of the gospel, and their preaching, is the utmost stretch of malice and effrontery. But I do them no injury when I retort upon them the very thing out of which they attempt to rear up a charge against us. For where do the despisers of God learn their daring licentiousness, except it be from imagining, amid the uproar of dissensions, that there is nothing which they are not licensed to do? In this, therefore, let them recognise it as their own crime, viz., that by retarding the course of truth, they encourage the wicked with hopes of impunity.

As to the vituperative allegation, that we are devoid of discipline and laws, fitted to keep the people under due restraint, we are provided with a twofold answer. Were I to say that discipline is adequately established among us, I should be refuted by the daily discourses, in which our teachers lament that it still lies neglected. But while I

Digitized by Google

deny not that we want the blessing of thorough discipline, still, I say, it ought to be considered who the persons are to whom it has hitherto been, and still is, owing that we do not enjoy it, in order that they may be made to bear the blame. Let our enemies deny, if they can, that they employ every artifice for the purpose, not only of hampering our exertions in forming and constituting our churches, but also of defeating and overthrowing whatever we begin. We labour sedulously in building up the Church, and when we are intent on the work, they, ever and anon, make a hostile entrance to disturb our operations, and allow us no interval which we might employ in arranging the domestic concerns of the Church. After this they upbraid us with the dilapidation of which they are themselves the cause. What kind of ingenuousness is this, to give us constant annoyance, and then make it a charge against us, that, in consequence of that annoyance, we are not at leisure to arrange all the departments of the Church? God is witness to our grief, men witnesses to our complaints, on account of the distance we still are from perfection. But then it is said, there are some things pertaining to discipline which we have discarded. True; but as men are wont, in rebuilding a fallen edifice, to drag out and collect the fragments which lie in heaps, or scattered about, in order that they may fit each into its proper place, so were we obliged to act. For if any part of ancient discipline survived, it was so mixed and buried with the confused mass of ruins; it had so lost its pristine form, that no use could be made of it till it was gathered out from amidst the confusion.

I wish, at all events, our opponents would stimulate us by their example. But how? The discipline which they clamorously maintain that we have not, do they themselves possess? Would it not be better were they to unite with us in admitting and confessing their fault before God, than to upbraid us with what may instantly be retorted on their own heads?

Discipline consists of two parts, the one relating to the

Digitized by Google

clergy, the other to the people. Now, I wish to know with what strictness they confine their clergy to an upright and chaste behaviour. That purer and more refined holiness to which the ancient canons bind the clergy, I exact not of them. For I know how they laugh in their hearts when any one raises up from oblivion those laws which have now been dead for several ages. All I ask of their clergy is common decency, so that, if they are not distinguished for purity of life, they may, at least, not be infamous for turpitude. When any one, by means of gifts, or favour, or sordid obsequiousness, or surreptitious certificates, winds his way into the priesthood, the canons pronounce it simony, and order it as such to be punished. How many, in the present day, enter the priesthood by any other means? But adieu, as I have said, to that stern rigour. Still, were no enactment on the subject in existence, how disgraceful is it that the houses of bishops should be forges of open and adulterous simony? What shall I say of the Roman See, where it now seems matter of course that sacerdotal offices are openly disposed of to the highest bidder, or where they are the hire paid for panderism and sorcery, and the obscener crimes? If common sense has any influence amongst us, can it but seem monstrous that boys of twelve years of age should be made archbishops? When Christ was buffetted, was he more insulted than by this? Can there be a greater mockery to God and man, than when a boy is set to rule a Christian people, and installed in the seat of a father and pastor?

The injunctions of the canons concerning bishops and presbyters are, that all should be vigilant in their stations, and no one long absent from his church. But, let us suppose that there was no such precept, who sees not that the Christian name is subjected to the derision even of Turks, when the denomination of pastor of a church is given to one who does not pay it a single visit during his whole life? For, as to constant residence in the place where he has been appointed pastor, it is now long since an example of it became rare. Bishops and abbots either hold their own

Digitized by Google

courts, or dwell in ordinary in the courts of princes. Each, according to his disposition, selects the place where he may live in luxury. Those, again, who take more pleasure in their nest, are truly said to *reside* in their benefices, for they are lazy bellies, to whom nothing is less known than their duty!

It was forbidden by the ancient canons to give two churches to one individual. Well, let this prohibition be as it had never been. Still, with what gloss will they excuse the absurdity of bestowing five benefices, or more, on one man? of allowing one, and that one sometimes a boy, to possess three bishoprics, seated at such a distance from each other that he could scarcely make the circuit of them in a year, were he to do nothing else?

The canons require, that in promoting priests, a strict and minute examination be made into life and doctrine. Let us concede to the present times, that they cannot be tied down to so stern a rule. But we see how the ignorant, and those utterly devoid both of learning and prudence, are inducted without discrimination. Even in hiring a mule-driver, more regard is paid to his past life than in choosing a priest. This is no fiction, no exaggeration. True, they go through the form like players on a stage, that they may exhibit some image of ancient practice. The bishops, or their suffragans, put the question, whether those whom they have determined to ordain are worthy? There is some one present to answer that they are worthy. There is no occasion to go far for a witness, or to bribe him for his testimony. The answer is merely a form; all beadles, tonsors, and doorkeepers, know it by heart.

Then, after ordination, the least suspicion of lewdness in the clergy ought, according to the ancient canons, to be corrected, and the proof of it punished with deposition and excommunication. Let us remit somewhat of this ancient rigour. Yet, what will be said to such a toleration of daily lewdness, as might almost imply a right to commit it? The canons declare, that on no account shall a clergyman be permitted to indulge in hunting, or gaming, or revelry,

Digitized by Google

and dancing. Nay, they even expel from the ministry every man to whom any kind of infamy attaches. In like manner, all who involve themselves in secular affairs, or so intermeddle in civil offices as to distract their attention from the ministry—all, in fine, who are not assiduous in the discharge of their duties, they order to be severely censured, and, if they repent not, deposed. It will be objected, that these severe remedies, which cut all vices to the quick, this age cannot bear. Be it so, I do not call upon them for so much purity. But that an unbridled licentiousness should reign in the clergy, a licentiousness so unbridled that they, more than any other order, give additional taint to a world already most corrupt, who can forgive them?

With regard to the discipline exercised over the people, the matter stands thus:—Provided the domination of the clergy remains intact, provided no deduction is made from their tribute or plunder, almost any thing else is done with impunity, or carelessly overlooked. We see the general prevalence of all kinds of wickedness in the manners of society. In proof of this, I will call no other witnesses than your Imperial Majesty and Most Illustrious Princes. I admit that the fact is attributable to many causes, but among the many, the primary cause is, that the priests, either from indulgence or carelessness, have allowed the wicked to give loose reins to their lusts. How do they act at the present hour? What care do they employ in eradicating vices, or at least in checking them? Where their admonitions? Where their censures? To omit other things, what use is made of excommunication, that best nerve of discipline? True, they possess, under the name of excommunication, a tyrannical thunderbolt which they hurl at those whom they call contumacious. But what contumacy do they punish, unless it be of persons who, when cited to their tribunal about money matters, have either not appeared, or, from poverty, have failed to satisfy their demands? Accordingly, the most salutary remedy for chas-

Digitized by Google

tising the guilty, they merely abuse in vexing the poor and the innocent. They have, moreover, the ridiculous custom of sometimes flagellating hidden crimes with an anathema, as in the case where a theft has been committed and the thief is unknown. This practice is altogether at variance with the institution of Christ. But, though so many disgraceful proceedings take place openly before the eyes of all, as to them excommunication is asleep. And yet the very persons among whom all these disorders prevail have the hardihood to upbraid us with want of order! No doubt, if we are equally guilty, we gain nothing by accusing them; but in what I have hitherto said, my object has not been, by recrimination, to evade the charge which they bring against us, but to show the real value of that discipline which they complain that we have overthrown. If it is thought proper to compare the two, we are confident that our disorder, such as it is, will be found at all events somewhat more orderly than the kind of order in which they glory. I mean not to palliate or flatter our defects, when I thus speak. I know how much we require to be improved. Undoubtedly, were God to call us to account, excuse would be difficult; but when called to answer our enemies we have a better cause, and an easier victory than we could wish.

With similar effrontery, they clamour that we have seized upon the wealth of the Church, and applied it to secular purposes. Were I to say that we have not sinned in this respect, I should lie. Indeed, changes of such magnitude are seldom made without bringing some inconveniences along with them. If, herein, aught has been done wrong, I excuse it not. But, with what face do our adversaries present this charge against us? They say, it is sacrilege to convert the wealth of the Church to secular uses. I admit it. They add, that we do so. I reply, that we have not the least objection to answer for ourselves, provided they, too, in their turn, come prepared to plead their cause. We will immediately attend to our own case; meanwhile, let us see what they do. Of bishops I say nothing,

Digitized by Google

except what all see, that they not only rival princes in the splendour of their dress, the luxuries of their table, the number of their servants, the magnificence of their palaces, in short, every kind of luxury; but also, that they dilapidate and squander ecclesiastical revenues, in expenditure of a much more shameful description. I say nothing of field-sports, nothing of gaming, nothing of the other pleasures which absorb no small portion of their incomes. But, to take from the Church, in order to spend on pimps and harlots, is surely too bad. Then how absurd, not only to plume themselves on pomp and show, but to carry them to the utmost excess.

Time was, when poverty in priests was deemed glorious. So it was in the Council of Aquila. On one occasion, too, it was decreed that a bishop should reside within a short distance of his church in a humble dwelling, with a scanty table and mean furniture, (*Conc. Carth.* iv. cap. iv. Can. 14.) But, without going to that ancient rigour, after numerous corruptions had crept in with the progress of wealth, even then the ancient law was again confirmed which divided ecclesiastical revenues into four portions; one to go to the bishop for hospitality, and the relief of those in want, another to the clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth to the repairing of churches. Gregory attests that this rule was in full observance even in his day. Besides, were there no laws on the subject, and at one time there were none, (for that which I have mentioned was, as in the case of other laws, rendered necessary by the corruption of manners,) still there is no man who will not admit the truth of what Jerome says, (*ad Nepotianum,*) that it is the glory of a bishop to provide for the wants of the poor, and the disgrace of all priests to have a hankering after private wealth. It will, perhaps, be thought that another injunction, which he gives in the same passage, is too severe, viz., that open table should be kept for the poor, and for strangers. It is, however, equally well-founded.

The nearer abbots approach to bishops in extent of revenue, the more they resemble them. Canons and pa-

Digitized by Google

rish priests, not deriving enough from one cure for gluttony, luxury, and pomp, soon found out a compendious method of remedying the inconvenience. For there is nothing to prevent him who could, in one month, swallow much more than he draws in a year, from holding four or five benefices. The burden is nothing thought of. For there are vicars at hand ready to stoop, and take it on their shoulders, provided they are allowed to gobble up some small portion of the proceeds. Nay, few are found who will be contented with one bishopric, or one abbacy. Those of the clergy who live at the public expense of the Church, though able to live on their patrimony, Jerome styles sacrilegious, (*C. Cler.* I. Quæst. 2.) What, then, must be thought of those who at once engulf three bishoprics, *i. e.*, from fifty to a hundred tolerable patrimonies? And, lest they complain that they are unjustly traduced for the fault of a few, what are we to think of those who not only luxuriate on the public revenues of the Church, but abuse them in paying the hire of panders and courtesans? I speak only of what is notorious.

Then, were we to ask, I say, not at the whole order, but at the few who reside in their benefices, by what right they receive even a frugal and moderate stipend, even such a question they are not able to answer. For what duties do they perform in return? In the same way as anciently, under the law, those who served at the altar lived by the altar, "even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel," (1 Cor. ix. 9.) These are Paul's words. Let them, then, show us that they are ministers of the gospel, and I will have no difficulty in conceding their right to stipend. The ox must not be muzzled that treadeth out the corn. But is it not altogether at variance with reason that the ploughing oxen should starve, and the lazy asses be fed? They will say, however, that they serve at the altar. I answer, that the priests under the law deserved maintenance, by ministering at an altar; but that, as Paul declares, the case under the New Testament is different. And what are those altar

Digitized by Google

services, for which they allege that maintenance is due to them? Forsooth, that they may perform their masses and chant in churches, *i. e.*, partly labour to no purpose, and partly perpetrate sacrilege, thereby provoking the anger of God. See for what it is that they are alimented at the public expense!

There are some who accuse our princes of inexpiable sacrilege, as having, with violence and the greatest injustice, seized upon the patrimony of the Church, which had been consecrated to God, and as now dilapidating it for profane uses.

I have already declared that I am unwilling to be the apologist of everything that is done amongst us; nay, rather, I openly declare my dissatisfaction that more regard is not paid to the due application of ecclesiastical revenues to those purposes only for which they were destined. This I deplore in common with all good men. But the only point under discussion at present is, whether our princes sacrilegiously seized on the revenues of the Church, when they appropriated what they had rescued out of the hands of priests and monks? Is it profanation to apply these to some other purpose than stuffing such lazy bellies? For it is their own cause which our adversaries plead, not the cause of Christ and his Church. No doubt, heavy judgments are denounced against those who rob the Church, and carry off for their own use what belongs to her. But the reason is at the same time added, viz., because they defraud true ministers of their maintenance, and because, starving the poor to death, they are guilty of their blood. But what have our opponents to do with this? For who among their whole tribe can make the declaration which Ambrose once made, that whatever he possessed was the revenue of the needy; and again, that every thing which a bishop possesses belongs to the poor? (*Ambrose, Epist.* Lib. v. *Ep.* 31 *et* 33.) Nay, how few of them do not abuse what they possess with as much licence as if it had been given to be profusely squandered as they list? It is vain, therefore, for them to expos-

Digitized by Google

tulate, because deprived of that which they possessed without any right, and wasted with the greatest iniquity.

And it was not only lawful, but necessary also, for our princes so to deprive them. When they saw the Church absolutely destitute of true ministers, and the revenues destined for their support absorbed by lazy idle men; when they saw the patrimony of Christ and the poor either ingulfed by a few, or dissolutely wasted on expensive luxuries, were they not to interfere? Nay, when they saw the obstinate enemies of the truth lying like an *incubus* on the patrimony of the Church, and abusing it, to attack Christ, to oppress sound doctrine, and persecute its ministers, was it not right immediately to wrest it from their hands, that, at all events, they might not be armed and equipped by the resources of the Church to vex the Church? King Josiah is commended, on the authority of the Holy Spirit, because, on perceiving that the sacred oblations were improperly consumed by the priests, he appointed an officer to call them to account, (2 Chron. xxiv. 14.) And yet they were priests whom God had entrusted with the ordinary administration. What, then, is to be done with those who exercise no lawful ministry, and who not only, like them, neglect the repairing of the temple, but exert all their nerves and resources to pull down the Church?

But some one will ask, how are the appropriated revenues administered? Certainly not in a manner altogether free from blame, but still in a manner far better and holier than by our enemies. Out of them, at all events, true ministers are supported, who feed their flocks with the doctrine of salvation, whereas, formerly, churches left utterly destitute of pastors were burdened with the payment of them. Wherever schools or hospitals for the poor existed they remain; in some instances their revenues have been increased; in none have they been diminished. In many places, also, in lieu of monasteries, hospitals have been established where there were none before; in others new schools have been erected, in which not only have regular salaries been given to the

Digitized by Google

masters, but youths also are trained, in the hope of being afterwards of service to the Church.

In fine, churches derive many advantages in common from these revenues, with which, before, only monks and priests were gorged. Nor is it a small portion which is devoted to extraordinary expenses, though these are well entitled to be taken into account. It is certain that much more is consumed when matters are in disorder, than would be if proper arrangements were made among the churches. But nothing could be more unjust than to deny to our princes and magistrates the right of making expenditure of this kind, not for their private benefit, but to meet the public necessities of the Church. Besides, our adversaries forget to deduct their spoliations and unjust exactions, by which communities were pillaged for sacrifices, of which they are now relieved. But there is one reason which renders all this discussion, in a great measure, superfluous. More than three years ago, our princes declared their readiness to make restitution, provided the same course were enforced against those who detain a much larger amount for a less honourable cause, and who are guilty of much greater corruption in the administration of it. Our princes, therefore, stand bound to your Imperial Majesty by their promise. The document also is before the world; so that this should not be any hinderance to uniformity of doctrine.

The last and principal charge which they bring against us is, that we have made a schism in the Church. And here they boldly maintain against us, that in no case is it lawful to break the unity of the Church. How far they do us injustice, the books of our authors bear witness. Now, however, let them take this brief reply—that we neither dissent from the Church, nor are aliens from her communion. But, as by this specious name of Church, they are wont to cast dust in the eyes even of persons otherwise pious and right-hearted, I beseech your Imperial Majesty, and you, Most Illustrious Princes, *first*, to divest yourselves of all prejudice, that you may give an impartial ear to our defence; *secondly*,

Digitized by Google

not to be instantly terrified on hearing the name of Church, but to remember that the Prophets and Apostles had, with the pretended church of their days, a contest similar to that which you see us have in the present day with the Roman Pontiff and his whole train. When they, by the command of God, inveighed freely against idolatry, superstition, and the profanation of the temple, and its sacred rites, against the carelessness and lethargy of priests, and against the general avarice, cruelty, and licentiousness, they were constantly met with the objection which our opponents have ever in their mouths—that by dissenting from the common opinion, they violated the unity of the Church. The ordinary government of the Church was then vested in the priests. They had not presumptuously arrogated it to themselves, but God had conferred it upon them by his law. It would occupy too much time to point out all the instances. Let us, therefore, be contented with a single instance, in the case of Jeremiah.

He had to do with the whole college of priests, and the arms with which they attacked him were these, "Come, and let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for the law shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet," (Jer. xviii. 18.) They had among them a High Priest, to reject whose judgment was a capital crime, and they had the whole order to which God himself had committed the government of the Jewish Church concurring with them. If the unity of the Church is violated by him, who, instructed solely by Divine truth, opposes himself to ordinary authority, the prophet must be a schismatic; because, not at all deterred by such menaces from warring with the impiety of the priests, he steadily persevered. That the eternal truth of God, preached by the prophets and apostles, is on our side, we are prepared to show, and it is indeed easy for any man to perceive. But all that is done is to assail us with this battering-ram, "Nothing can excuse withdrawal from the Church." We deny out and out that we do so. With what, then, do they urge us? With nothing more than this, that to them belongs the ordi-

Digitized by Google

nary government of the Church. But how much better right had the enemies of Jeremiah to use this argument? To them, at all events, there still remained a legal priesthood, instituted by God; so that their vocation was unquestionable. Those who, in the present day, have the name of prelates, cannot prove their vocation by any laws, human or divine. Be it, however, that in this respect both are on a footing, still, unless they previously convict the holy prophet of schism, they will prove nothing against us by that specious title of Church. I have thus mentioned one prophet as an example. But all the others declare that they had the same battle to fight—wicked priests endeavouring to overwhelm them by a perversion of this term Church. And how did the apostles act? Was it not necessary for them, in professing themselves the servants of Christ, to declare war upon the synagogue? And yet the office and dignity of the priesthood were not then lost. But it will be said, that, though the prophets and apostles dissented from wicked priests in doctrine, they still cultivated communion with them in sacrifices and prayers. I admit they did, provided they were not forced into idolatry. But which of the prophets do we read of as having ever sacrificed in Bethel? Which of the faithful, do we suppose, communicated in impure sacrifices, when the temple was polluted by Antiochus, and profane rites were introduced into it?

On the whole, we conclude that the servants of God never felt themselves obstructed by this empty title of Church, when it was put forward to support the reign of impiety. It is not enough, therefore, simply to throw out the name of Church, but judgment must be used to ascertain which is the true Church, and what is the nature of its unity. And the thing necessary to be attended to, first of all, is, to beware of separating the Church from Christ its Head. When I say Christ, I include the doctrine of his gospel, which he sealed with his blood. Our adversaries, therefore, if they would persuade us that they are the true Church, must, first of all, show that the true doctrine of God is among them; and this is the meaning of what we often repeat, viz., that

Digitized by Google

the uniform characteristics of a well-ordered Church are the preaching of sound doctrine, and the pure administration of the Sacraments. For, since Paul declares (Eph. ii. 20) that the Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," it necessarily follows that any church not resting on this foundation must immediately fall. I come now to our opponents.

They, no doubt, boast in lofty terms that Christ is on their side. As soon as they exhibit him in their word we will believe it, but not sooner. They, in the same way, insist on the term Church. But where, we ask, is that doctrine which Paul declares to be the only foundation of the Church? Doubtless your Imperial Majesty now sees that there is a vast difference between assailing us with the reality and assailing us only with the name of Church. We are as ready to confess as they are that those who abandon the Church, the common mother of the faithful, the "pillar and ground of the truth," revolt from Christ also; but we mean a Church which, from incorruptible seed, begets children for immortality, and, when begotten, nourishes them with spiritual food, (that seed and food being the Word of God,) and which, by its ministry, preserves entire the truth which God deposited in its bosom. This mark is in no degree doubtful, in no degree fallacious, and it is the mark which God himself impressed upon his Church, that she might be discerned thereby. Do we seem unjust in demanding to see this mark? Wherever it exists not, no face of a church is seen. If the name, merely, is put forward, we have only to quote the well-known passage of Jeremiah, "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, The temple of the Lord, are these," (Jer. vii. 4.) "Is this house, which is called by my name, become a den of robbers in your eyes?" (Jer. vii. 11.)

In like manner, the unity of the Church, such as Paul describes it, we protest we hold sacred, and we denounce anathema against all who in any way violate it. The principle from which Paul derives unity is, that there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all,"

Digitized by Google

who hath called us into one hope, (Eph. iv. 4, 5.) Therefore, we are one body and one spirit, as is here enjoined, if we adhere to God only, *i. e.*, be bound to each other by the tie of faith. We ought, moreover, to remember what is said in another passage, "that faith cometh by the word of God." Let it, therefore, be a fixed point, that a holy unity exists amongst us, when, consenting in pure doctrine, we are united in Christ alone. And, indeed, if concurrence in any kind of doctrine were sufficient, in what possible way could the Church of God be distinguished from the impious factions of the wicked? Wherefore, the Apostle shortly after adds, that the ministry was instituted "for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God: That we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ," (Eph. iv. 12–15.) Could he more plainly comprise the whole unity of the Church in a holy agreement in true doctrine, than when he calls us back to Christ and to faith, which is included in the knowledge of him, and to obedience to the truth? Nor is any lengthened demonstration of this needed by those who believe the Church to be that sheepfold of which Christ alone is the Shepherd, and where his voice only is heard, and distinguished from the voice of strangers. And this is confirmed by Paul, when he prays for the Romans, "The God of patience and consolation grant you to be like minded one toward another, according to Christ Jesus; that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," (Rom. xv. 5, 6.)

Let our opponents, then, in the first instance, draw near to Christ, and then let them convict us of schism, in daring to dissent from them in doctrine. But, since I have made it plain, that Christ is banished from their society, and the doctrine of his gospel exterminated, their charge against us simply amounts to this, that we adhere to Christ in preference to them. For what man, pray, will believe that those

Digitized by Google

who refuse to be led away from Christ and his truth, in order to deliver themselves into the power of men, are thereby schismatics, and deserters from the communion of the Church? I certainly admit that respect is to be shown to priests, and that there is great danger in despising ordinary authority. If, then, they were to say, that we are not at our own hand to resist ordinary authority, we should have no difficulty in subscribing to the sentiment. For we are not so rude, as not to see what confusion must arise when the authority of rulers is not respected. Let pastors, then, have their due honour—an honour, however, not derogatory in any degree to the supreme authority of Christ, to whom it behoves them and every man to be subject. For God declares, by Malachi, that the government of the Israelitish Church was committed to the priests, under the condition that they should faithfully fulfil the covenant made with them, viz., that their "lips should keep knowledge," and expound the law to the people, (Mal. ii. 7.) When the priests altogether failed in this condition, he declares, that, by their perfidy, the covenant was abrogated and made null. Pastors are mistaken if they imagine that they are invested with the government of the Church on any other terms than that of being ministers and witnesses of the truth of God. As long, therefore, as, in opposition to the law and to the nature of their office, they eagerly wage war with the truth of God, let them not arrogate to themselves a power which God never bestowed, either formerly on priests, or now on bishops, on any other terms than those which have been mentioned.

But, because they hold that the communion of the Church is confined to a kind of regimen which they have struck out for themselves, they think it sufficient to decide the victory in their favour, when they point to our alienation from the Romish See. But to this vaunted primacy of the Romish See it is not difficult to reply. It is a subject, however, on which I will not here enter, both because it would occupy too much time, and because it has been amply discussed by our writers. I will only beg your Imperial Majesty, and Most Illustrious Princes, to listen to Cyprian, when he points

Digitized by Google

out a better method of ascertaining the true communion of the Church, than that of referring it, as our opponents do, to the Roman Pontiff alone. For, after placing the only source of ecclesiastical concord in the episcopal authority of Christ, which episcopal authority he affirms that each bishop, to the extent to which it has been communicated, holds entire, he thus proceeds: "There is one church, which, by the increase of its fruitfulness, spreads into a multitude, just as there are many rays of the sun, but only one light, many branches in a tree, but one trunk, upheld by its tenacious root; and when many streams flow from one fountain, though, from the copiousness of the supply, there seems a division into parts, still, in regard to the origin, unity is preserved. Separate a ray from the body of the sun, the unity of the light is not divided. Break a branch from a tree, that which is broken cannot germinate. Cut off a stream from the fountain, and it dries up. So, also, the Church of God, irradiated with light, sends its beams over the whole world. Still it is one light which is everywhere diffused. The unity of the body is not violated." (*Cyprian De Unitat. Ecclesiæ.*) Heresies and Schisms, therefore, arise when a return is not made to the origin of truth, when neither the head is regarded, nor the doctrine of the heavenly Master preserved. Let them then show us a hierarchy in which the bishops are distinguished, but not for refusing to be subject to Christ, in which they depend upon him as the only head, and act solely with reference to him, in which they cultivate brotherly fellowship with each other, bound together by no other tie than his truth; then, indeed, I will confess that there is no anathema too strong for those who do not regard them with reverence, and yield them the fullest obedience. But is there any thing like this in that false mask of hierarchy on which they plume themselves? The Roman Pontiff alone as Christ's vicar is in the ascendant, and domineers without law and without measure, after the manner of a tyrant, nay, with more abandoned effrontery than any tyrant. The rest of the body is framed more according to his standard than that of Christ. The light of which Cyprian speaks is extinguished, the copious fountain

Digitized by Google

cut off; in short, the only thing exhibited is the tallness of the tree, but a tree dissevered from its root.

I am aware that our adversaries have good reason for labouring so strenuously to maintain the primacy of the Romish See. They feel that on it both themselves and their all depend. But your part, Most Invincible Emperor, and Most Illustrious Princes, is to be on your guard in order that they may not with vain glosses deceive you, as they are wont to deceive the unwary. And, first, this vaunted supremacy, even themselves are forced to confess, was established by no divine authority, but by the mere will of man. At least, when we give proof of this fact, though they do not expressly assent, they seem as if ashamed to maintain the opposite. There was a time, indeed, when they audaciously perverted certain passages of Scripture to confirm this palpable falsehood, but as soon as we came to close quarters, it was found easy to pluck out of their hands the bits of lath, to which, when at a distance, they had given the appearance of swords. Abandoned, accordingly, by the Word of God, they flee for aid to antiquity. But here, also, without much ado, we dislodge them. For both the writings of holy Fathers, the acts of Councils, and all history, make it plain that this height of power, which the Roman Pontiff has now possessed for about four hundred years, was attained gradually, or rather was either craftily crept into, or violently seized. But let us forgive them this, and let them take for granted that primacy was divinely bestowed on the Romish See, and has been sanctioned by the uniform consent of the ancient Church; still there is room for this primacy only on the supposition that Rome has both a true church and a true bishop. For the honour of the seat cannot remain after the seat itself has ceased to exist. I ask, then, in what respect the Roman Pontiff performs the duty of a bishop, so as to oblige us to recognise him as a bishop? There is a celebrated saying of Augustine, "Bishopric is the name of an office, and not a mere title of honour." And ancient Synods define the duties of a bishop to consist in feeding the people by the preaching the Word, in administering the sacraments, in curbing

Digitized by Google

clergy and people by holy discipline, and, in order not to be distracted from these duties, in withdrawing from all the ordinary cares of the present life. In all these duties, presbyters ought to be the bishop's coadjutors. Which of them do the Pope and his Cardinals pretend to perform? Let them say, then, on what ground they claim to be regarded as legitimate pastors, while they do not, with their little finger, in appearance even, touch any part of the duty.

But let us grant all these things, viz., that he is a bishop who entirely neglects every part of his duty, and that a Church which is destitute, as well of the ministry of the Word as of the pure administration of the Sacraments; still, what answer is made when we add not only that these are wanting, but that every thing which exists is directly the reverse? For several centuries that See has been possessed by impious superstitions, open idolatry, perverse doctrines, while those great truths, in which the Christian religion chiefly consists, have been suppressed. By the prostitution of the Sacraments to filthy lucre, and other abominations, Christ has been held up to such extreme derision, that he has in a manner been crucified afresh. Can she be the mother of all churches, who not only does not retain, I do not say the face, but even a single lineament, of the true Church, and has snapt asunder all those bonds of holy communion by which believers should be linked together? The Roman Pontiff is now opposing himself to the reviving doctrines of the gospel, just as if his head were at stake. Does he not, by this very fact, demonstrate that there will be no safety for his See unless he can put to flight the kingdom of Christ? Your Imperial Majesty is aware how wide a field of discussion here opens upon me. But to conclude this point in a few words: I deny that See to be Apostolical, wherein nought is seen but a shocking apostacy—I deny him to be the vicar of Christ, who, in furiously persecuting the gospel, demonstrates by his conduct that he is Antichrist—I deny him to be the successor of Peter, who is doing his utmost to demolish every edifice that Peter built—and I deny him to be the head of the Church, who by his tyranny

Digitized by Google

lacerates and dismembers the Church, after dissevering her from Christ, her true and only Head. Let these denials be answered by those who are so bent on chaining the hierarchy of the Church to the Romish See, that they hesitate not to subordinate the sure and tried doctrines of the gospel to the authority of the Pope. Yea, I say, let them answer; only do you, Most Invincible Emperor, and Most Illustrious Princes, consider whether, in so calling upon them, the thing I ask is just or unjust.

From what has been said, it will doubtless be easy for you to perceive how little attention is due to the calumny of our adversaries, when they accuse us of impious presumption, and as it were inexpiable audacity, in having attempted to purify the Church from corruption, both in doctrine and ceremonies, without waiting for the beck of the Roman Pontiff. They say we have done what private individuals have no right to do. But, in regard to ameliorating the condition of the Church, what was to be hoped from him to whom we were required to give place? Any man who considers how Luther and the other Reformers acted at the outset, and how they afterwards proceeded, will deem it unnecessary to call upon us for any defence. When matters were still entire, Luther himself humbly besought the Pontiff that he would be pleased to cure the very grievous disorders of the Church. Did his supplication succeed? The evils having still increased, the necessity of the case, even had Luther been silent, should have been stimulus enough to urge the Pope to delay no longer. The whole Christian world plainly demanded this of him, and he had in his hands the means of satisfying the pious wishes of all. Did he do so? He now talks of impediments. But if the fact be traced to its source, it will be found that he has all along been, both to himself and to others, the only impediment. But why insist on these lighter arguments? Is it not in itself alone an argument of sufficient clearness and sufficient weight, that, from the commencement up to the present time, he gives us no hope of transacting with him until we again bury Christ, and return to every impiety which formerly existed, that he may

Digitized by Google

establish them on a firmer basis than before? This, unquestionably, is the reason why still, in the present day, our opponents so strenuously maintain that we had no right to intermeddle with the revival of the church—not that the thing was not necessary, (this it were too desperate effrontery to deny,) but because they are desirous that as well the safety as the ruin of the Church should be suspended on the mere beck and pleasure of the Roman Pontiff.

Let us now attend to the only remedy left us by those who think it impiety to move a finger, how great soever the evils by which the Church is oppressed. They put us off to an universal council. What? If the major part, from obstinacy, rush upon their own destruction, must we therefore perish along with them, when we have the means of consulting for our own safety? But they tell us it is unlawful to violate the unity of the Church, and that unity is violated if any party decide an article of faith by themselves, without calling in the others. Then they enlarge on the inconveniences to which such a course might lead—that nothing could be expected but fearful devastation and chaotic confusion, were each people and nation to adopt for itself its peculiar form of faith. Things like these might be said justly, and even appositely to the occasion, if any one member of the Church, in contempt of unity, should of its own accord separate itself from the others. But that is not the point now in dispute. I wish, indeed, it were possible for all the monarchs and states of the Christian world to unite in a holy league, and resolve on a simultaneous amendment of the present evils. But since we see that some are averse to amelioration, and that others involved in war, or occupied with other cares, cannot give their attention to the subject, how long, pray, must we, in waiting for others, defer consulting for ourselves? And more freely to explain the source of all our evils, we see that the Roman Pontiff, if he can prevent it, will never permit all churches to unite, I do not say in due consultation, but in assembling any council at all. He will, indeed, as often as he is asked, give promises in abundance, provided he sees all the ways shut up, and all modes of

Digitized by Google

access interrupted, while he has in his hand obstructions which he can every now and then throw in, so as never to want pretexts for tergiversation. With a few exceptions, he has all the cardinals, bishops, and abbots, consenting with him in this matter, since their only thought is how to retain possession of their usurped tyranny. As to the welfare or destruction of the Church, it gives them not the least concern.

I am not afraid, Most Invincible Cæsar, and Most Illustrious Princes, that my statement will seem incredible, or that it will be difficult to persuade you of its truth. Nay, rather I appeal to the consciences of you all, whether I have stated any thing which your own experience does not confirm. Meanwhile, the Church lies in the greatest peril. An infinite number of souls, not knowing in what direction to turn, are miserably perplexed; many even, forestalled by death, perish, if not saved miraculously by the Lord; diversified sects arise; numbers, whose impiety was formerly hid, assume, from the present dissensions, a licence to believe nothing at all, while many minds, otherwise not ill disposed, begin to part with their religious impressions. There is no discipline to check these evils; amongst us who glory in the name of Christ only, and have the same baptism, there is no more agreement than if we professed religions entirely different. And the most miserable thing of all is, that there is at hand, nay, almost in sight, a breaking up of the whole Church, for which, after it has taken place, it will be in vain to seek for remedies. Seeing, therefore, that in bringing assistance to the Church in her great distress and extreme danger, no celerity can be too rapid, what else do those who put us off to a General Council, of which there is no prospect, but insult both God and man? The Germans must therefore submit to have this sentence passed upon them, that they choose to look on quietly and see the Church of God perish from their land, when they have the means of curing her disorders, or they must instantly bestir themselves to the work. This second alternative they will never adopt so speedily, as not

Digitized by Google

to be even now deservedly condemned for not adopting sooner. But those persons, whoever they be, who, under the pretext of a General Council, interpose delay, clearly have no other end in view, than by this artifice to spin out the time, and are no more to be listened to than if they confessed in word what they in deed demonstrate, that they are prepared to purchase their private advantage by the destruction of the Church.

But it is said that it would be unprecedented for the Germans alone to undertake this reformation; that in no case when controversy has arisen concerning the doctrines of religion, was it ever heard that a single province could undertake the investigation and decision. What is this I hear? Do they imagine that by their mere assertion they will persuade the world to believe what the histories of all times refute? As often as some new heresy emerged, or the Church was disturbed by some dispute, was it not the usual custom immediately to convene a Provincial Synod, that the disturbance might thereby be terminated? It never was the custom to recur to a General Council until the other remedy had been tried. Before bishops from the whole Christian world met at Nice to confute Arius, several Synods had been held with that view in the East. For the sake of brevity, I pass over the other instances, but the thing which our enemies shun as unusual is proved by the writings of the ancients to have been the ordinary practice. Have done, then, with this lying pretence of novelty.

Had this superstitious idea possessed the African Bishops, they would have been too late in meeting the Donatists and Pelagians. The Donatists had already gained over a great part of Africa to their faction, nor was any place entirely free from the contagion. It was a controversy of the greatest moment, relating to the unity of the Church and the due administration of baptism. According to the new wisdom of our opponents, the orthodox Bishops, in order not to cut themselves off from the other members of the Church, ought to have referred the question to a

Digitized by Google

General Council. Is this what they do? Nay, rather, knowing that in extinguishing an actual fire no time can be lost, they press and follow close upon the Donatists, now summoning them to a Synod, now coming, as it were, to close quarters with them in discussion.

Let our enemies condemn of impious separation from the Church, Augustine, and the other holy men of that age who concurred with him, for having, by imperial authority, without convoking a General Council, forced the Donatists to dispute with them, and hesitated not to treat in a Provincial Synod of a most difficult and dangerous controversy. There, too, Pelagius had shown his horns; instantly a Synod was held to repress his audacity. When, after having for a short time feigned penitence, he had returned to his vomit, with the stigma which had been fixed on his impiety in Africa he betook himself to Rome, where he was received with considerable favour. What course do the pious Bishops take? Do they allege that they are only a member of the Church, and must wait for relief from a General Council? Nay, they themselves assemble on the very first opportunity, and again and again anathematise the impious dogma with which many had now been infected, freely deciding and defining what ought to be held on the subjects of original sin and regenerating grace. Afterwards, indeed, they send to Rome a copy of their proceedings, partly that, by a common authority and consent, they may the more effectually crush the contumacy of the heretics, partly that they may admonish others of a danger, against which all ought to stand upon their guard. The flatterers of the Roman Pontiff give the matter a different turn, as if the Bishops had suspended their judgment until the proceedings were ratified by Innocent V., who then presided over the Church of Rome. But this impudent averment is more than refuted by the words of the holy Fathers. For they neither ask Innocent to counsel them as to what they ought to do, nor do they refer it to him to decide, nor do they wait for his nod and authority, but they narrate that they

Digitized by Google

had already taken cognisance of the cause, and passed sentence, condemning both the man and the doctrine, in order that Innocent, too, might imitate their example, if he desired not to fail in his duty. These things were done while as yet the churches agreed with each other in sound doctrine. Now, then, when all things threaten ruin if not speedily remedied, why hang waiting for the consent of those who leave not a stone unturned to prevent the truth of God, which they had put to flight, from again beaming forth?

Ambrose, in his day, had a controversy with Auxentius on the primary article of our faith, viz., the divinity of Christ. The Emperor favoured the view of Auxentius. He does not, however, appeal to a General Council, under the pretext of its being unlawful that so important a cause should be decided in any other manner. He only demands, that, being a question of faith, it should be discussed in the church in presence of the people. And to what end the Provincial Synods, which were once regularly held twice a-year, unless that Bishops might consult together on emerging circumstances, as the nineteenth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon explains. An ancient enactment orders that the Bishops of every province shall convene twice a-year. The Council of Chalcedon gives us the reason, that any errors which may have emerged may be corrected. Our opponents, contrary to what all know, deny the lawfulness of touching a corruption of doctrine or manners, until it has been laid before a General Council. Nay, the very subterfuge by which the Arians Palladius and Secundinianus declined the Council of Aquileia was, because it was not full and general, all the Eastern Bishops being absent, and few even of the West making their appearance. And it is certain that of the Italians scarcely a half had convened. The Roman Bishop had neither come in person, nor sent any one of his presbyters to represent him. To all these objections Ambrose replies, that it was not a thing without example for the Western Bishops to hold a synod,

Digitized by Google

since the practice was familiar to those of the East—that the pious Emperors who summoned the Council had acted wisely in leaving all at liberty to come, without compelling any; and, accordingly, all who thought proper had come, none being prohibited. Though the heretics continued to press their quibbling objections, the holy Fathers did not, therefore, abandon their purpose. Assuredly, after such examples, your Imperial Majesty is not to be prohibited from using the means within your reach of bringing back the body of the empire to sacred concord.

Though, as has been observed, our enemies, who advise procrastination, do it not with the view of shortly after consulting for the welfare of the Church, but only of gaining time by delay, knowing, that if they can throw us back to a General Council, the truce will be long enough; let us, however, assume that there is no obstacle to a General Council being immediately called; let us even assume that it has been summoned in good earnest, that the day of meeting is at hand, and all things prepared. The Roman Pontiff will, of course, preside, or if he declines to come, he will send one of his Cardinals as Legate to preside in his stead, and he will doubtless select the one whom he believes will be most faithful to his interests. The rest of the Cardinals will take their seats, and next them the Bishops and Abbots. The seats beneath will be occupied by ordinary members, who are, for the most part, selected for subservience to the views of those above. It will, indeed, happen, that some few honest men will have seats among them, but they will be despised for the smallness of their number, and, made weak by fear, or dispirited by the hopelessness of doing any good, will be silent. Should any one of them, perchance, attempt to speak, he will instantly be put down by noise and clamour. But the great body will be ready to suffer any thing, sooner than allow the Church to be restored to a better condition.

I say nothing of doctrine. Would that they could only

Digitized by Google

come to the cause with an honest and docile temper. But it is certain as certainty itself, that the single resolution of all will be not to listen to any thing that is said, or to the arguments by which it is supported, be they what they may. Nay, they will not only stuff their ears with stubbornness and obstinacy, that they may not obey the truth, but will also arm themselves with ferocity to resist it. And why? Is it credible that those who do not admit into their ears any mention of sound doctrine, will spontaneously withdraw their opposition, as soon as it comes to be a matter of present practice? Can we hope that those who are constantly plotting to prevent the fallen kingdom of Christ from again rising in the world, will give a helping hand to raise it up, and advance it? Will those who are now, with fire and sword, raging against the truth, and doing all they can to whet and inflame the cruelty of others, show themselves moderate and humane? But were there nothing else, I leave it to your prudence, Most Invincible Emperor, and yours, Most Illustrious Princes, to consider whether or not it is for the private interest of the Roman Pontiff, and his whole faction, that the Church should be restored to true order, and its most corrupt condition reformed, according to the strict standard of the gospel. How much it is their wont to forget their own advantage, and, in disregard of it, to engage with heart and soul in promoting the common welfare, you have learned by a sure experience!

Sire, will you leave the Church to them, that they may decide concerning its reformation at their own will, or rather their own caprice? Will you remain waiting for their nod, resolved never to consult for the Church till they consent? If they know this to be your intention, they will disentangle themselves by an easy process. They will decide that things must remain as they are. But let us suppose that they will be so overcome, either by a sense of shame, or by the authority of your Majesty, and the other Princes, as to put on some appearance of moderation, and part with some small portion of their power;

Digitized by Google

will they, even of their own accord, condescend so far as to allow themselves to be reduced into order, that the kingdom of Christ may be upraised? But if they will not, to what end is the care of reforming the Church committed to them, unless it be to expose the sheep to the wolves? If there is no other alternative, it were better that the Church should be given up as desperate, than that she should fall into the hands of such physicians.

It had, indeed, become those who have the name and hold the office of pastors, to be the first of all to fly to her assistance. It had, I admit, become them to come forward as leaders, and unite the princes with them, as associates and coadjutors in this holy work. But what if they decline to do it themselves? What if they are unwilling it should be done by others? What if they leave not a stone unturned in order to prevent it? Are we, then, still to have regard to them? must no man move till they give the signal? Must we still listen to that solemn saw of theirs, "Nothing must be attempted till the Pope has approved?" Let your Majesty, then, be assured, and do you also, Most Illustrious Princes and distinguished personages, lay it to heart, as a certain fact, that the Church, not only betrayed, deserted, and left destitute by her pastors, but vexed, overwhelmed with calamity, and doomed to destruction, throws herself on your protection. Nay, rather view it in this way—God has now furnished you with the means of giving a sure and striking proof of your fidelity towards Him. There is nothing in which all men ought to feel a deeper interest, nothing in which God wishes us to exhibit a more intense zeal, than in endeavouring that the glory of His name may remain unimpaired, His kingdom be advanced, and the pure doctrine, which alone can guide us to true worship, flourish in full vigour. How much more, therefore, does it become princes to make these things their care, to design, commence, and prosecute them to a close, seeing God has honoured them with a communication of His name, that they may be on earth the guardians and vindicators of His glory?

Digitized by Google

Be unwilling, I beseech you, to lend an ear to ungodly men, who either cajole you with a false show of counsel, in order that the Church may receive no alleviation at your hand, or disparage the cause—though it is the greatest of all causes—that you may be more remiss in undertaking it, or urge you to violent methods of proceeding in it. Hitherto, Most Invincible Emperor, in endeavouring to inflame you with rage, and, in a manner, clothe you in armour, they have lost their labour, and you will certainly transmit to posterity the distinguished praise, both of mildness and prudence, in not having suffered yourself to be once moved from moderation by the turbulent counsels, which have been so often and so strongly pressed upon you. Be it at all times your care that this praise be not wrested from you by the importunity of our enemies. Augustine acknowledges the discipline to be bad which terrifies heretics, but does not teach them. If heretics, who, by their intemperance, and without any just cause, disturb the Church, are to be treated with a mildness ensuring that instruction shall always precede chastisement, how much more becoming is it to use humanity in this cause, in which we call God and men to witness that we seek nothing but a sincere consent on both sides to the pure doctrine of God? That the Roman Pontiff and his followers breathe nothing but blood and slaughter, you yourself, Sire, are the best witness. Had you yielded to their fury, Germany had long ago been deluged with her own blood. You, too, Most Illustrious Princes, well know the fact. Can it be that it is the Spirit of God which drives them on headlong to such cruelty? But thus it is; licentiousness, which has long stalked abroad without hinderance, no sooner feels the curb than it breaks out into madness. If there are any, besides those who desire to see us crushed by violence and arms, either enkindled by the breath of others, or instigated from within by an inconsiderate zeal, they hate a cause which they know not. For the very same thing of which Tertullian complains in his Apology, as having happened to the Church when she first arose, is also experienced by us in

Digitized by Google

the present day. We are condemned merely from prejudice against our name, without any investigation of our cause. And what do we contend for now, save that our cause, after due cognisance has once been taken of it, may at length be decided, according to truth and equity, and not according to any falsely preconceived opinion? Sire, it is, indeed, a noble proof both of humanity and of singular wisdom, that you have hitherto resisted the urgency with which our enemies have endeavoured to hurry you into an unjust severity. The next best thing is not to yield to the pernicious counsels of those who, under specious pretexts for delay, have for a long time hindered this holy work, (I mean the reformation of the Church;) and what is worse, are endeavouring to prevent it altogether.

There is, perhaps, one remaining difficulty which prevents you from commencing the work. Very many, not otherwise indisposed, are deterred from engaging in this holy undertaking, merely because antecedently to the attempt they despair of its success. But here two things ought to be considered; the one, that the difficulty is not so great as it appears to be, and the other, that, however great it be, there is nothing in it which ought to dispirit you, when you reflect that it is the cause of God, and that He overruling it, both our hopes may be surpassed and our impressions prove erroneous. The former of these it is no part of my present design to explain; a fitter opportunity will be found, when once the matter comes to be taken into serious consideration. This only I will say, that the execution will be more expeditious, and of less difficulty than is commonly supposed, provided there is courage enough in attempting it. However, considering, according to the well known sentiment of an old proverb, that there is nothing illustrious which is not also difficult and arduous, can we wonder, that in the greatest and most excellent of all causes, we must fight our way through many difficulties? I have already observed, that if we would not give deep offence to God, our minds must take a loftier view. For it is just to measure the power of God by the extent of our own powers,

Digitized by Google

if we hope no more of the restoration of the Church than the present state of affairs seems to promise. How slender soever the hope of success, God bids us be of good courage, and put far away every thing like fear, that we may with alacrity begirt ourselves for the work. Thus far, at least, let us do Him honour. Confiding in his Almighty power, let us not decline to try what the success is which He may be pleased to give.

In the present condition of the empire, your Imperial Majesty, and you, Most Illustrious Princes, necessarily involved in various cares, and distracted by a multiplicity of business, are agitated, and in a manner tempest-tossed. But be always assured, that of all works this one is undoubtedly entitled to take precedence. I feel what nerve, what earnestness, what urgency, what ardour, the treatment of this subject requires. And I am well aware that persons will not be wanting to express their surprise, that on a subject so noble and splendid I should be so cold. But what could I do? I bend under its weight and magnitude; and I therefore see not how I can do better than set the matter before you simply, without any embellishment of words, that you may afterwards ponder and scrutinize it. First, call to mind the fearful calamities of the Church, which might move to pity even minds of iron. Nay, set before your eyes her squalid and unsightly form, and the sad devastation which is everywhere beheld. How long, pray, will you allow the spouse of Christ, the mother of you all, to lie thus prostrated and afflicted—thus, too, when she is imploring your protection, and when the means of relief are in your hand? Next, consider how much worse calamities impend. Final destruction cannot be far off, unless you interpose with the utmost speed. Christ will, indeed, in the way which to him seems good, preserve his Church miraculously, and beyond human expectation; but this I say, that the consequence of a little longer delay on your part will be, that in Germany we shall not have even the form of a Church. Look round, and see how many indications threaten that ruin which it is your duty to prevent,

Digitized by Google

and announce that it is actually at hand. These things speak loud enough, though I were silent.

Such indications, however, ought not only to move us by their actual aspect; they ought also to remind us of coming vengeance. Divine worship being vitiated by so many false opinions, and perverted by so many impious and foul superstitions, the sacred Majesty of God is insulted with atrocious contumely, his holy name profaned, his glory only not trampled under foot. Nay, while the whole Christian world is openly polluted with idolatry, men adore, instead of Him, their own fictions. A thousand superstitions reign, superstitions which are just so many open insults to Him. The power of Christ is almost obliterated from the minds of men, the hope of salvation is transferred from him to empty, frivolous, and nugatory ceremonies, while there is a pollution of the Sacraments not less to be execrated. Baptism is deformed by numerous additions, the Holy Supper is prostituted to all kinds of ignominy, religion throughout has degenerated into an entirely different form.

If we are negligent in remedying these evils, God assuredly will not forget himself. How could He who declares that he will not allow his honour to be in any way impaired, fail to interpose when it is cast down and destroyed? How could He who threatens with destruction all the nations among whom prophecy shall have failed, permit our open and contumacious contempt of the prophecies to go unpunished? How could He who punished a slight stain on his Supper so severely in the Corinthians, spare us in presuming to pollute it with so many unutterable blasphemies? How could He who, by the mouths of all his prophets, testifies and proclaims that he is armed with vengeance against idolatry, leave untouched in us so many monstrous idolatries? Assuredly He does not so leave them, for we see how, sword in hand, he urges and pursues us. The Turkish war now occupies the minds of all, and fills them with alarm. It well may. Consultations are held to prepare the means of resistance. This, too, is prudently and necessarily done. All exclaim that there is need of

Digitized by Google

no ordinary dispatch. I admit that there cannot be too much dispatch, provided, in the meantime, the consultation which ought to be first, the consultation how to restore the Church to its proper state, is neither neglected nor retarded. Already delays more than enough have been interposed. The fuel of the Turkish war is within, shut up in our bowels, and must first be removed, if we would successfully drive back the war itself.

In future, therefore, as often as you shall hear the croaking note—The business of reforming the Church must be delayed for the present—there will be time enough to accomplish it after other matters are transacted—remember, Most Invincible Emperor, and Most Illustrious Princes, that the matter on which you are to deliberate is, whether you are to leave to your posterity some empire or none. Yet, why do I speak of posterity? Even now, while your own eyes behold, it is half bent, and totters to its final ruin. In regard to ourselves, whatever be the event, we will always be supported, in the sight of God, by the consciousness that we have desired both to promote his glory and do good to his Church; that we have laboured faithfully for that end; that, in short, we have done what we could. Our conscience tells us, that in all our wishes, and all our endeavours, we have had no other aim. And we have essayed, by clear proof, to testify the fact. And, certainly, while we feel assured, that we both care for and do the work of the Lord, we are also confident, that he will by no means be wanting either to himself or to it.

But be the issue what it may, we will never repent of having begun, and of having proceeded thus far. The Holy Spirit is a faithful and unerring witness to our doctrine. We know, I say, that it is the eternal truth of God that we preach. We are, indeed, desirous, as we ought to be, that our ministry may prove salutary to the world; but to give it this effect belongs to God, not to us. If, to punish, partly the ingratitude, and partly the stubbornness of those to whom we desire to do good, success must prove desperate, and all things go to worse, I will say what it befits a

Digitized by Google

Christian man to say, and what all who are true to this holy profession will subscribe:—We will die, but in death even be conquerors, not only because through it we shall have a sure passage to a better life, but because we know that our blood will be as seed to propagate the Divine truth which men now despise.

Digitized by Google

A

PATERNAL ADMONITION

BY THE

ROMAN PONTIFF, PAUL III.,

TO THE

MOST INVINCIBLE EMPEROR, CHARLES V.

CHASTISING HIM,

BOTH BECAUSE HE HAD BEEN TOO INDULGENT TO THE LUTHERANS, AND ALSO BECAUSE HE HAD ASSUMED SOME AUTHORITY IN CALLING A COUNCIL, AND DEFINING CONTROVERSIES OF FAITH.

Digitized by Google

TO THE READER.

This ADMONITION, as well for other reasons as for containing a remarkable specimen of Pontifical zeal, is every way worthy of being read by all. The opportunity ought to have been sooner afforded; but mysteries of this description do not instantly come into the hands of those whose interest or inclination it is to publish them; and, therefore, if this treasure appears later than was to have been wished, the reader will pardon the delay.

Digitized by Google

LETTER OF POPE PAUL III.

TO THE

EMPEROR CHARLES V.

SUBJECT.

THE previous year, the Emperor, after he had prepared to invade France, perceiving that the tranquillity of Germany could not be long maintained, unless, antecedent to his departure, some method were adopted by which the States of the Empire, notwithstanding of their religious dissensions, might remain at peace, issued an edict, providing that, until the matter were investigated, the parties should enjoy equal terms, and promising that he would embrace the earliest opportunity of calling a General, or, at least, a National Council, or, failing this, that he would endeavour at the next Imperial Diet, after due discussion, that something should be finally resolved. The cause of piety was, indeed, deserving, above all others, of occupying the attention of the Emperor; but, being involved in a difficult and dangerous war, and unable to enter immediately on the subject, the wise and right-hearted Prince feared, not without reason, that disturbances might take place in his absence. It therefore seemed that nothing would be more conducive to the common safety of the Christian Church, and the public tranquillity of Germany, or more convenient for his own private arrange-

Digitized by Google

ments, than, while postponing the full consideration of the cause till a future period, to leave the parties in possession of equal rights, and under an equitable administration of the laws. The Roman Pontiff, however, here shows that the publication of this edict had, for two reasons, given him no small concern. For, however slight the concession made to the Protestants, however little their relief from unjust prejudices, he makes an outcry about excessive indulgence, while the Emperor's assumption of some jurisdiction in matters of religion he regards as a criminal indignity offered to himself. He complains that the Emperor, in claiming illegal jurisdiction, had committed two sins:—*First*, He had presumed, without consulting him, to promise a Council; and, *Secondly*, He had not hesitated to undertake an investigation alien to his office. The holy Father, therefore, bitterly expostulates with him, both for his excessive lenity to the Lutherans, and for having violated and impaired the authority of the Roman See.

PAUL III. SUPREME PONTIFF, TO THE EMPEROR CHARLES V.

Dearest Son, Salvation and Apostolical Benediction.

From the Edict of your Majesty, we have learned the acts of your Diet at Spires, in regard to which acts, while our fatherly love for you does not allow us to disguise our sentiments, the nature of the office and duty committed to us by God through Christ, for the guardianship of the universal church, compels us to admonish you in plain terms. (1.)[1] To this we are not a little moved by the impressive example of the Divine severity towards Eli the priest, against whom, for treating his children too indulgently, and wink-

[1] The Figures in the Letter and in the Remarks correspond to each other, and point out the particular passages animadverted upon.

Digitized by Google

ing at their faults, there stands recorded the following severe sentence: "Because he knew that his children acted improperly, and did not correct them," therefore, saith the Lord, "the iniquity of his house shall not be expiated for ever by victims and offerings." This was the Divine sentence; and it was immediately followed by the sudden and violent death, first of the sons, and then of Eli himself, and the consequent rejection of his posterity from the priesthood, thus fulfilling the word of the Lord.

(2.) Therefore, dear son, when we perceived from the acts of the Diet certain unbecoming decrees, and more unbecoming proposals,—of a kind, indeed, that, if carried into effect, (which God forbid,) will not only most assuredly endanger the salvation of your soul, but expose the peace and unity of the Church, which we ought to study above all things, to greater perturbation than they have hitherto suffered; we were truly unwilling to let them pass without sending this letter to one who has been (3.) committed to us by God, to be honoured and loved as a first-born son, to admonish him of this great peril, both to himself and to the Church. We have not, however, thought it necessary to admonish you as if you resembled the sons of Eli, whom a depraved disposition, and habitual wickedness, rendered almost inaccessible to pure discipline, but rather as one who, during the course of many years, entered not into the counsel of the ungodly. For this reason, we have the greater hope that our paternal admonition will not prove in vain. (4.) But, dear son, every thing depends on this, that you do not allow yourself to be withdrawn from the unity of the Church, that you do not backslide from the custom of the most religious Princes, your forefathers, but in every thing pertaining to the discipline, order, and institutions of the Church, pursue the course by which you have, for many years, given the strongest proofs of heart-felt piety.

(5.) And the nature of this course is, as often as any dispute arises concerning matters of religion, to refer the decision always, and in all points, to the Apostolic See, and determine nothing till it has been consulted. But now, dear

Digitized by Google

son, when you make mention of a General Council as the most seasonable remedy for the afflicted condition of the Church, particularly in Germany, or of a National Council, (for this also you notice,) or of a future Imperial Diet against next autumn, in which you promise to treat of religion and other matters thereto appertaining, while you thus act, while you thus resolve, you suppress the name of him to whom laws, human and divine, with the approving consent of so many centuries, have given (6.) supreme authority in calling Councils, (7.) in determining with regard to them, and in arranging all matters having reference to the unity and welfare of the Church.

Nor are these the only points in which we complain that the practice of the Church, and of your ancestors, has been not at all observed by you. For among the decrees of the late Diet may be read other things besides, and not few in number, which are both most hurtful to piety, and subversive of all legal order. (8.) For when you propose that laics are to have the power of judging concerning spiritual things, and not only laics, but laics indiscriminately, (9.) even the assertors of damnable heresies,—(10.) when you determine concerning ecclesiastical property, and future controversies relating thereto,—when those who (11.) were out of the Church, and were long ago condemned by your own edict, you restore to their former honours in courts and tribunals, and this do of your own imperial authority, (12.) certainly not with the approbation of others, who persevere in ancient and holy obedience, (13.) which of those things, pray, accords with the divine customs and laws by which the Church has been perpetually governed? Nay, they rather entirely deprive the Church of all discipline, and of all order, without which no human society can be governed.

But the more at variance these things are with all right discipline, and with the customs of our forefathers, the less able are we to believe that they could ever emanate from your own judgment. Our belief is, that your wonted piety has for a time been suppressed by the counsels of bad men, who are now in rebellion against this Holy See, and who, if

Digitized by Google

unable to obtain your approval to the things which they wished to do against it, have, as we can easily suppose, laboured at least to obtain from you, by means of those edicts, some indication of alienated affection. And that they have obtained it we are the more grieved,[1] the more firmly we are persuaded of the loss and detriment which must accrue both to you and to the Church, if you do not speedily return to yourself. This we cannot but dread more and more every day, the more attentively we consider who the persons are with whom you have formed a friendship. For if, as an Apostle says, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," how much more is this to be dreaded, (14.) when one is united in leagues and counsels with the wicked?

We doubt not, indeed, that they have gained you over to their measures by suggesting hopes of piety, utility, and honour, but no counsel is so utterly bad that it cannot deck itself with some such specious names as a gorgeous robe. But do you, son, "rather ask your father, and he will tell you, your ancestors, and they will declare to you." For they all with one voice exhort you to maintain the unity of the Church, and yield honour and obedience to this Holy See, as they all along exhorted you by their deeds, while all who are most distinguished for holiness and skill in the divine laws will, if you consult them, tell you that the severest of the divine judgments have befallen those, who, by whatever cause, by whatever appearance of piety induced, (15.) thought proper to assume to themselves the prerogatives of High Priest. The strongest of these inducements is that which the rebellious are wont to suggest, when they urge Princes to mount the High Priest's chair, and assert a right and authority to deliberate and decide on religious causes. (16.) For they employ the negligence of Priests as

[1] In Calvin's Works, vol. viii. p. 178, Ed. Amst., 1667, the words are, "Impetrare vero tanto magis debemus," &c. This is evidently a misprint. In the Latin edition of Pallavicini's History of the Council of Trent, in which the Admonition is given at length, the words are, "Id vero eos impetrasse tanto magis dolemus," and from them the translation has been made.

Digitized by Google

a motive to stimulate Princes to take upon themselves the settlement of religious controversies, and the ordering of ecclesiastical affairs. And who does not at first sight deem the act deserving of the highest praise? Every man will so deem it, if the act only be looked to. But, as in a well-ordered household, in which the duties and offices are divided, it is not lawful for any one member to take it upon him to perform them all, though each of them is excellent in its kind, or, if he attempts it, though with a good intention, he is deservedly reprimanded by the head of the family, as, by an unseasonable zeal, destroying as far as possible the fairest thing in the house, (17.) namely, the order, without which no house can long stand, and doing the greatest injury to the wisdom of him who arranged it; (18.) so, in the Church of Christ, which is the house of God, in which all the offices are portioned out, and distributed each to each in such a way, that inferiors may not perform the offices of their superiors, it is still less lawful to disturb its order, in as much as it has been arranged with greater wisdom than can be supposed to exist in any house. This is ever a most grievous insult to the foresight and wisdom of God.

All, however, do not see this, nor, Emperor, do we suppose that you yet sufficiently see the great injury which you offer to Divine Providence, when in this house of God, in which supremacy has been committed to priests, you assume to yourself honour and office. (19.) Neither did Uzzah see it when, reverentially accompanying the ark of God, which was drawn in a waggon by oxen, he put forth his hand to prevent it from falling, they having become restive. Who, among men, would have ventured to disapprove of the act? Who would not rather have commended him highly for putting forth his hand, when the priests were absent, and the ark already leaning over, was threatened with disaster by a wanton ox, as the Scriptures term it? There is no man who would not have applauded it as piously done, had not God shown by the severity of the punishment, that it was by no means agreeable to him,—immediately depriving Uzzah of life, for no other reason, (so the Scripture declares,)

Digitized by Google

than for having rashly presumed to supply what pertained to the office of Priests and Levites. That there was so much sinfulness in the act, who could have imagined? But, by this example, God wished to warn us not to provoke his wrath, by falling into the same snare. Of this thing we were desirous now to warn you, lest, induced by the deceitful persuasions of those who have the reformation of the Church ever in their mouths, you might be tempted in so great an assemblage, not of oxen, but of priests, wantoning, as it were, while they bear it on their shoulders, rashly to put forth your hand; for this is the office and duty of the priests of God.

(20.) Into the same snare fell Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who, dissatisfied that in a holy nation one should shine pre-eminent in dignity as High Priest, resisted both Moses and Aaron, saying, "It is enough for you that the whole multitude are saints, and the Lord is among them, why do ye exalt yourselves above the people?" Though the words seem directed against both, yet, from the explanation of Moses, we learn that Aaron's office of High Priest was the cause of all their indignation. When the whole people were holy, they thought it unjust that any one individual should excel in dignity. How grievously the thing offended God is shown by the signal display of his justice and severity against them. The earth, yawning, swallows them up, with their furniture and all that belonged to them.

These ancient events I now recount, because (as an Apostle says) they happened to them in a figure, and were written for our correction, on whom the ends of the world are come, that all may learn that if, (21.) in regard to a priesthood which served a tabernacle and shadow, and which, with the tabernacle, Divine Providence had determined to abolish, God manifested such care, as not to allow even the smallest change upon it by men's device to pass unavenged, how much greater reverence should be paid to those priests, who no longer serve a type and shadow to be abolished, but the true tabernacle itself, which shall never be removed, and how much less ought we to think of changing even the

Digitized by Google

minutest arrangement relating to them? In short, how much more grievously, and with how much more intolerable presumption, must we suppose those to sin against Divine Providence, who insist either on throwing this arrangement into confusion, or on transferring it to themselves, or who desire in any way to decide respecting (22.) that which long practice in the Church, founded on the testimony of Scripture, sets forth and declares? Whatever be the mode, whatever the semblance of piety, wherever such schemes are attempted, there can be no doubt that pride, which is the root of the evil, is odious to God.

(23.) This is strikingly illustrated by the example of King Uzziah, in which Scripture sets before us both the root of the evil and its heavy punishment. The king, who, as Scripture testifies, was, in other respects, entitled to the highest praise, is charged with presumption, only in this, that he desired to burn incense at the altar. Who would not have deemed this a pious rather than a presumptuous desire? But the Spirit of God in Scripture, when he comes to narrate the act, says, "The heart of Uzziah was lifted up." But wherein lifted up? In that he wished to perform another's office. After he was warned by the priests, but would not obey them, God instantly smote him with leprosy. These things, dearest son, we now pass in review before you, that you may perceive if it was a presumptuous act in Uzziah to burn incense upon the altar, how much more presumptuous it must be to burn incense upon the altar of Christ's body, and prosecute other measures closely connected with religion? But think you it is not incense before God to enact laws concerning religion? It is, indeed, incense, incense, too, of all things, the most agreeable to God, (for, be assured, no odour is more grateful,) but to offer it is not your office, Emperor. It belongs to the priests of the Lord, and, (24.) in particular, to us, to whom God has given the power of loosing and binding. Consider into what part of the temple you enter, when, as at this day, you usurp their office. It is not into the court or into the sanctuary like Uzziah, for the act is not only holy, but the

Digitized by Google

holiest, and, therefore, when you, at your own hand, penetrate hither, it is into the house of the Lord you penetrate, and into the holy of holies; you penetrate the very body of Christ in arrogating to yourself his office.

It is no excuse to say that the act is holy, or that the laws which you propose to enact are not perpetual, but temporary, *i. e.*, to last till the future Council. For though the act is in itself pious, yet in one to whom God has not given this ministry it is most impious. (25.) For you are assuming to yourself a prerogative which is peculiar to God, to whom, alone, is reserved the judgment of priests; a prerogative which no one may assume, though only for a time. It is thus that God addresses wicked priests: "I myself, who am over the shepherds, will require my flock at their hand." As God will do this thoroughly in his own time, so, (26.) whenever any one has, meanwhile, attempted, as by anticipation, to wrest it from his hand, for such daring he has always received the severest punishment. On the other hand, God has never allowed an age to pass without testifying, by some sure signs, that his greater mercies, both internal and external, and blessings of every kind, are due to those who, by their favour and assistance, enlarging and adorning the priesthood, have fostered the unity of the Church, and its principal See, (27.) as we perceive in the case of Constantine the Great, the Theodosii, and Charlemagne, than whom no Christian Emperors were more distinguished for the divine favour and for victory. Those, again, who withstood the priests, God not only permitted to fall into all kinds of turpitude, but often chastised with signal punishments, in testimony of his divine anger. We now speak not of those who attempted to strangle the Church at its birth, of the Neros, the Domitians, and others of the sort, but of those who persecuted it when full grown, and when beginning to exert the authority of its office over Princes, the See of Peter was in the eyes of all Princes constituted and confirmed. Those who resisted its authority were so chastised by God as to make it manifest how grateful to God obedience to this See

Digitized by Google

is, and has always been, and, on the contrary, how displeasing and hateful is disobedience.

(28.) The first of the Emperors we read of, who broke out in open revolt and in contempt of this holy See, was Anastasius. Gelasius, the Roman Pontiff, admonished him not to favour the party of Acatius, Bishop of Constantinople, who had been condemned by the Apostolic See, but he disobeyed the admonition. Hormisdas, the successor of Gelasius, having sent legates to him to urge him to desist from communion with heretics, he first heard them with contempt, and then dismissed them with insult. At length the divine anger struck him dead by lightning. He was succeeded in his impiety, but at intervals, by other Emperors, (29.) as Mauritius, (30.) Constans, the second son of Justinianus Constantinus Pogonatus, Philip, and Leo. But it were tedious to number up those who perished by deaths, differing in their nature, but all violent or ignominious, after having been previously stript of their power and dignity, that in them Divine justice might manifest itself, as taking vengeance on the disobedient. (31.) The series might be continued as far as that Henry who had long most grievously vexed the Apostolic See, but at length made captive at Lodi by his own son, died in prison, Divine vengeance, by a most just retribution, punishing by a son him who had, in so many ways, molested and disregarded the authority of one whom Divine Providence had set over him in the Church, in the place of a father. (32.) The same thing may be said of Frederick the Second, except that his death, by strangulation, was more disastrous, in as much as his own son was the executioner.

It is true, however, that God does not always punish rebels in this way, since some of them he so permits to enjoy their own desires, that, in regard to external punishment, they seem to sin with impunity, and live in affluence, as if they were happy. Holy Fathers have piously thought that the reason why Divine Providence thus acts is, lest men should suppose, that if all the wicked were punished here,

Digitized by Google

Divine justice has no other tribunal. God, therefore, that He may be duly acknowledged, openly punishes some as an example, while, in a manner, winking at the crimes of others, He reserves them for a severer sentence at His future judgment-seat. No sin, however, is dismissed unpunished. But of all punishments, the most fearful is, when those who offend God most grievously think they do it with impunity. For all such are struck with mental blindness, and given over to lusts, ignominy, and a reprobate mind, these being what the Apostle enumerates as the proper scourges of the wicked.

But while these are common to all the wicked, there are others especially reserved for those who have exerted their impiety (33.) in assailing the principal See, and in rending the unity of the Church. This, indeed, we have observed in certain persons, who, the more shining their virtues were while they persevered in holy obedience, were, after their impious revolt, the more given up to monstrous passions of avarice, lust, and cruelty. History relates, that this was the case with Anastasius, whom we mentioned above. And would that we had not similar examples in this our day! But Divine vengeance thus punishing disobedience to this prime See has been signally manifested, not only on individuals, but also on kingdoms and provinces, in which we see that though the severest punishments of all have been inflicted on those who refused to have Christ for their Lord, the next place of wretchedness has been allotted to those who resisted the authority of the vicegerent of Christ. Two nations in particular, at one time most flourishing, have been thus chastised and smitten. The one persisted in pertinaciously denying Christ, and the other was long notorious above all other nations for contending with His vicegerent. The former is the nation of the Jews, than which none has suffered greater misery, (34.) the latter, the nation of the Greeks, who approached nearest to the Jews in misery, because they had approached nearest to them in impiety. Wherefore, if, in the case of emperors, kings, states, and nations, Christ himself, while preserving the authority of his

Digitized by Google

vicegerent, has never allowed contempt of it to pass unavenged—if, by visiting disobedience with severe judgments, he shows how hateful to him such attempts have always been, how much would you sin against yourself, Cæsar, if (which God forbid) you were to attack this authority, seeing that in the eyes both of God and man this would be deemed more hateful in one descended from Emperors, who have rendered to the Apostolic See not more honour than they received from it?

We write not these things, dearest son, as if we could persuade ourselves in any way that such counsels are ratified and confirmed in your mind; but as a father loving the honour and welfare of his son, and solicitous concerning both of them, as soon as we saw the edict of the Diet of Spires, we thought it our duty to warn you, and that the more gravely the more we were afraid of the peril to which you are exposed. In short, if we have at greater length dissuaded you from assuming power and authority to settle disputes in matters pertaining to religion, we have not written because we were not most desirous that disputes should be settled, (35.) (that this might be duly done, our conscience testifies we would willingly shed our life's blood,) but that we might admonish you by examples, drawn both from sacred Scripture and from ecclesiastical history, not to arrogate to yourself, or to order of your Imperial authority, that which pertains not to your office. We exhort you rather to follow the example of Constantine the Great, a most distinguished servant of God, and a most happy Emperor, (36.) and leave those who are to be judged and chastised to their own judge and judges. For he, when requested by the priests themselves to judge in their disputes, positively declined. (37.) His words to this effect, as given by historical writers who were present, are, "God has appointed you priests, and given you power to judge us also; therefore, we are rightly judged by you, whereas you cannot be judged by men; for which reason, wait for the judgment of God alone to decide between you, and let your quarrels, whatever they be, be reserved for that divine scrutiny." Thus spoke he who is surnamed

Digitized by Google

Great, not so much for his power, which was most extensive, as for his piety and other virtues, and whom, Cæsar, it is our wish and desire that you should thoroughly resemble in all things.

Your earnest desire that religious controversies be settled, and some strictness of discipline renewed throughout the whole Church, we highly applaud, and we beg of you to give your assistance in this matter, and give it to him to whom God has committed the care of this ministry. For, as it is our opinion, that in handling matters of this description, you, by no means, ought to act as the head, so we desire your assistance in particular, as that of a most appropriate arm. It is owing to this our desire, (38.) that on any, even the least hope of assembling an œcumenical Council, we have always been not only prompt in summoning it, but whenever the smallest spark of hope that it could be assembled beamed forth, we instantly dispatched legates, as we did also on the last occasion, though not with the success which we assiduously desire. Indeed, we have chosen to make every attempt rather than lose the very least opportunity. This we continue to expect of the Divine goodness. We earnestly long for a Council, both for the sake of the interest of the whole Church, and especially the famous German Empire, which, long harassed in the extreme by discord in religious matters, is in a state of disunion, but whose safety we have always hoped (as your Majesty also admits) we may be able most conveniently to promote by a General Council.

(39.) In complaining as we now do, that you have used the counsels of those who have already been condemned by this See, we, indeed, complain, not merely because we are always desirous that they should be removed from your counsels, or because we ask, that those who have been once condemned remain ever condemned. God is our witness, that there is nothing we more long for than to bring back lost sheep to the fold of the Lord, and see the whole of that noble empire united in faith and religion, (40.) with the head and the rest of the body, in all love and friendship, and

Digitized by Google

that for the reasons we have mentioned. But while they remain dispersed from the head and the rest of the body, (it is of such we speak,) while they are out of the Church, being condemned by your edict also, you are setting more value on their friendship than you ought, and treating them with too much indulgence. Seeing that this your indulgence, and the declarations of former edicts which you have passed at different times, have not only not had the effect of bringing them to a sounder mind, but rather, as the event has proved, furnished them with the occasion of becoming more insolent, and more bold in seizing on their neighbours' goods, you certainly seem, by this method, more to foment discord than to remove it. But that matters will be most effectually restored to a better condition, not by means inconsistent with the manners and customs of our forefathers, and with the divine law itself, but by a General Council, we always have hoped in the Lord, and do hope even now; and, therefore, consulting the convenience of that province more than any other, we sent our legates (41.) to the entrance of Germany, even as far as Trent. Then we called, but there was none to hear. We came, and there was no man. Nevertheless, we desist not, but we still call and cry to you and the other Princes, exclaiming with the prophet David, (42.) "Come, let us lament before the Lord," (for there cannot be a more appropriate commencement of the Council,) and with Daniel, "I pray for my own sins and those of the people, I accuse, confess, and entreat. O Lord, we have sinned, we have committed iniquity, we have done wickedly, and gone backwards. To us belongeth confusion of face, and to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, for we have sinned, but to thee, O Lord, belong mercy and propitiation." To such a Council, therefore, we invite you,—(43.) a Council in which we hope to have the angels themselves for councillors. If they rejoice over one sinner doing penitence, how much more will they rejoice over the whole Church, of which they are themselves a part, when assembled for penitence? Moreover, while the safety of Christendom is threatened by the most powerful, and perpetual enemy of the Christian

Digitized by Google

name, the Turkish despot, we see not in what way it can be secured, unless by the united forces of Christians living in faith and charity. Wherefore, beloved son, pave the way for such a Council, (this is your appropriate office,) and you will pave it, if you either, as much as in you lies, restore to Christendom a peace so earnestly desired by all, or establish a truce until the Church can assemble a Council. There your disputes may be decided more equitably than by violence. This do, both you and the other Christian Princes, whom we will admonish again and again on this subject, and, in particular, him with whom you are at war.

The Council is now at hand, for it was long ago summoned, and has never been recalled, though, on account of the wars, deferred to a more convenient season. To this effect, therefore, dearest son, exert yourself, and give this joy first to Christendom, which has long been worn out by intestine wars, and next to us, having nothing on earth dearer than yourself, who in our love hold the place of a first born. Give this proof of divine virtue in you, not only not turning away from your father's affectionate admonition, as those do whom God, in testimony of desertion, gives up to their own devices, (44.) but regarding him as sent to you at this time, by the command of God, to support you when falling, and free you from great peril to your soul's salvation; embrace him with all piety, listen cheerfully to his voice, and obey his admonitions. These you will duly obey, if, when human counsels, working on human frailty, have been able to turn you from the holy path, as the prophet calls it, (though it is indeed a king's highway, being that of your ancestors, most religious princes,) being warned, you instantly display your divine disposition, and seeing the truth, resolve that in things which pertain to religion you will not claim any right and authority, (45.)—if, following the divine institution and the practice of the Church, you entirely exclude all discussions concerning priests and religion from Imperial Diets, (those not being present who have authority to take cognisance of such matters,) and refer them to their proper tribunal;—(46.) if, in regard to ecclesiastical proper-

Digitized by Google

ty, of which the Lord himself, for whom it is preserved, has left and committed it to priests to judge, you give no decision, and laying arms aside, either study peace, or, if peace cannot otherwise be obtained, give power to the General Council to judge of those points which have so long fomented pernicious wars in Christendom;—(47.) if, in fine, you rescind and nullify those concessions which, from excessive indulgence, you have made to the contumacious who are in rebellion against this holy See.

For, dearest son, while these are things which bring your own soul into great peril, and disturb the peace of the Church more and more, you can easily understand, if you do not at the earliest remedy these evils, (as we hope you will,) to what straits you will reduce us, leaving us no alternative but either, to the very great detriment of the Church, to be wanting to the duty and office given to us by God through his Son, or to act more severely than accords with either our practice, our nature, or our inclination. To our duty in such an emergency, we certainly ought not to be wanting, nor, in so far as we can promise for ourselves through the grace of Him whom on earth we represent, though unworthily, will we be wanting to it. For there is impressed upon our mind, and present to our eyes, the example which we mentioned at the outset,—the example of divine severity toward Eli the priest, who, we read, was not condemned because he refrained altogether from correcting his sons; (it is plain enough, from Scripture, that he did correct them;) but because, as St Jerome says, in correcting them he acted with the lenity of a father, not with the authority of a Pontiff. So long as matters were entire we acted with the lenity of a father; but, if transactions are to take place in terms of the edict, (which God forbid,) I see well enough, from the example of Eli, the necessary steps which you will oblige us to take.

Wherefore, Cæsar, consider with yourself what best becomes you, what best fulfils your duty towards God and the Church, and what is most conducive to your own honour and advantage. Is it to lend an arm to our justice in things

Digitized by Google

which pertain to the unity of the Church, or is it to favour those who, having once violated this unity, desire and labour miserably to rend it into a still greater number of parts?

May the God of peace, of his infinite mercy, deliver your Majesty from the counsels of the wicked, and establish in your heart counsels of peace, that, being of one mind, we may with one mouth honour God the Father, through Jesus Christ, to whom, with the Holy Spirit, be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

Given at Rome, on the Feast of St Mark,
25th August 1544.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

REMARKS

ON THE

LETTER OF POPE PAUL III.

BY

JOHN CALVIN.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

REMARKS.

(1.) If the most Holy Father trembles at that example of the Divine vengeance, it is strange why he is so very solicitous about this one fault of the Emperor, (if fault it should be called,) and slumbers so secure over the countless villanies of his own sons. God punished the negligence of Eli in not chastising his sons, (1 Sam. ii. 31.) The Apostle Paul enjoins that the sons of a Christian pastor be well behaved, and well trained in the fear of the Lord, (1 Tim. iii. 4.) One Paul Farnese has a son, and by him grandsons, besides bastards, who still spring from the old dotard, and his half-rotten carcase. What kind of person is Pier-Luigi? I will say the severest of all the things which can be said, and yet most true—Italy never produced such a monster before! Paul, why do you not bestir yourself? When the execrable lusts of this your son have risen to heaven, when the land is polluted by their abomination, when the whole world is crying out, do you not think it time to exercise severity? What shall I say of his avarice? What of his rapacity? What of his cruelty? Although, in all these things, he has surpassed all others, he is still inferior to yourself. Then what has the world long been indignantly saying of your grandsons, and of your whole family? If Eli was punished for indulgence, will you pass with impunity, when you not only in silence connive at the horrid crimes of your sons, but lend

Digitized by Google

them a helping hand? When it is certain you openly approve, and as to a great part admit without disguise, that they perpetrate them at your instigation. Does not the justice of God here alarm you? Does no fear strike deep into your soul? But now more than enough of *actual* sons. You give out that you are the father of all Christians. In the deplorable corruption of the world, is there any room for taciturnity? You are silent, however, and though you know, and with your eyes see, that the world is rushing to destruction, you bear it in silence. If God did not spare Eli, what punishment, think you, is impending over yourself? I come nearer home. In what state is your See, which ought to be to you as a family? What are your vicars doing? What kind of traffic is going on in your court? How do your clergy comport themselves? What Sodom will you find for me, where there ever was greater impunity for all kinds of evil? More abandoned shamelessness? More unbridled licentiousness? And now, just as if you had nothing to do at home, you fear lest the wrath of God may be impending over your head for this one fault—if you silently allow peace and equality of rights to be conceded to the Protestants, until the question of religion shall be discussed, if you tolerate Cæsar in promising, without your order, a Council, as well as a legitimate determination of the cause.

(2.) Here Athaliah comes into my mind. For, as that abandoned woman, when she saw King Joash placed upon the throne, felt that her own tyranny had fallen, and cried out, "Treason! treason!" (2 Kings xi. 14;) so this vile priest, when he sees even the smallest infringement on the tyranny, which, against the will of God and man, he most impiously arrogates to himself, confounds heaven and earth, as if nothing in the world were any longer safe.

(3.) O how many signal proofs has Cæsar received of this paternal love! Did not Christian princes dread this idol as some sinister deity, they might disclose strange offices of charity which each has individually experienced at his hand. But what need is there to divulge the secrets of princes, as

Digitized by Google

if it were not plain to the humblest individual what kind of father he has hitherto shown himself to be?

(4.) Once, indeed, the specious gloss of the Romish harlot was the boasted unity of the Church, but it has now been worn off by long use. It has so often been blown away by the blast of the Lord's mouth, and so effaced by the clear testimony of Scripture, that she is no longer able with it to hide her ugliness even from the blind. For Christ is the only bond of holy unity. He who departs from him disturbs and violates unity, while out of him there is nothing but sacrilegious conspiracy. Roman antichrist invites us to himself, under the pretence of unity, and pronounces all to be schismatics who do not spontaneously submit to be harnessed to the yoke of his tyranny. We, however, on the other hand, hear the words of Christ, "Where the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together." We hear the Spirit exhorting us to be "of one heart, of one mind," but in Christ. We hear the pious admonition of Hilary, "The name of peace is, indeed, specious, and the idea of unity beautiful, but who knows not that the only united peace of the Church and the Gospel is that which is of Christ?" Let Farnese then show that Christ is on his side, and he will prove that the unity of the Church is with him. But seeing it is impossible to adhere to him without denying Christ, he who turns aside from him makes no departure from the Church, but discriminates between the true Church and a church adulterous and false.

(5.) According to the definition of Farnese, the order, the discipline, the perfection of Christianity, consist in allowing the tyranny of his See to remain untouched. All other things may go, for, compared with these, he counts them all as nothing. Here, then, we recognise the Helen for whom he fights, and at the same time the cause of the fear which he expressed at the outset. For he not only foresees ruin impending over his throne, but he feels that, unless he bestir himself, his seat of abomination is already overthrown. Allow him, as of old, to wanton secure in the tranquil possession of his tyranny, and he will be content. As if the state

Digitized by Google

of the Church were duly settled, he will congratulate himself and all other men. Though Rome be a sink of wickedness scarcely better than hell itself, though the holy Papal clergy, with loosened reins, breaking through all laws, and casting off all sense of honour, prostitute themselves to every kind of impiety, though the whole world be fearfully corrupt, there will, notwithstanding, be a well-ordered discipline, provided nothing is attempted against the majesty of the Romish See!

(6.) No doubt, it is a heinous crime, that when the assembling of a Council was considered, the name of the Pope should have been suppressed! As if Constantine had bestowed on Sylvester the privilege of convening the Council of Arles, and had not called it, of his own right, in the exercise of his imperial authority, and as if he had not summoned Sylvester himself to come; or as if Theodosius had waited for either the determination or the nod of the Roman Bishop in calling the Council of Aquileia, over which Ambrose presided. Here is a General Council, held in Italy, at which the Roman Bishop was not present, and no one in his name; nay, in the acts of that Council he is never once mentioned. But we must pardon Farnese when he acts the part of wicked Jesabel, seeing he has a similar cause. For, in the same way in which she clamoured when Ahab of his royal authority assembled the people, that it might be determined once for all whether God or Baal were to be worshipped, so this worthless man clamours as if everything were lost, and a great crime committed, because the Emperor has undertaken to provide for the assembling of a Council. But then he alleges, that both by divine and human law this power is competent only to himself! It is easy to throw out the assertion, but we desiderate the proof. Was there ever a more impudent falsehood than this? Not a single syllable of divine law can he produce, unless, indeed, he make out that he himself is God. But perhaps human law favours him? Not one whit more. For who called the first Council of Nice, and who called those of Ephesus, of Constantinople, of Chalcedon? And, not to be

Digitized by Google

tedious in enumerating, who, for whole five hundred years, assembled all the General Councils that were held during that period, but the Emperor alone? But, perhaps, it was done after the Pope had interponed his authority? Nay, even without his consent. Will Farnese show, that in this matter the nod of the Pope was waited for, or even his advice asked? But he now not only arrogates to himself this privilege, so that the Emperor must not attempt any thing without consulting him, but he insists, at the same time, that there is nothing which he cannot and will not do. To obtain this, he must previously abolish all acts of Councils, and all ancient history. For by these, it is not the Pope who issues edicts to the Emperor, but the Emperor to all Bishops. And when the Bishops speak, they declare that they were summoned not by the command or beck of the Roman Bishop, but by Imperial edict. On one occasion, indeed, in procuring the Synod of Chalcedon, Leo interfered. But in what way? In ordering or decreeing? There is nothing to that effect in his letters, which are extant, and may easily be seen, but by humbly entreating the Emperor to summon all Bishops, according to custom. The thing, therefore, which Leo then earnestly entreated, when done in the present day, Farnese makes the ground of a bitter charge, maintaining it to be almost a species of apostacy. Let him, therefore, seek support for his fictitious authority in some other quarter than from either God or man.

(7.) In one instance, where the Pope made some such claim in the Council of Carthage, the African Bishops stoutly, as became them, withstood his dishonest ambition, and when he pretended that jurisdiction over the Churches was given him by a Canon of the Council of Nice, they gave no credit to it, but sent to Constantinople, and other Greek cities, to investigate the fact. Ultimately, it was discovered that the acts of the Council had been corrupted by the most Holy Father, that he might pervert them in rearing up his tyranny; at least the copies which were produced from his archives did not correspond with copies

Digitized by Google

that were certainly genuine. Accordingly, his demand was rejected, not without strong suspicion of forgery. But he says, that here also laws human and divine support him. What God, pray, ever appointed the Pope examiner, arbiter, and judge of all causes relating to the Church or to faith? And what laws of men, what decrees can he produce to that effect? Ambrose, indeed, says, that questions of faith ought to be discussed in the Church in presence of the people; and the question then under discussion was the leading article of our faith. He does not say before the Pope's tribunal. I admit, he says, that they are to be judged by priests, but he by no means gives the judgment to one Pope. Had he done so, he must have sinned grievously, when at the Council of Aquileia he was not only present at the investigation of a most important cause, but actually presided. Let Farnese inveigh against Ambrose for having dared, after he had persuaded the Emperor to summon a Council, to hold it, though in the absence of the Roman Bishop, and there determine the view which ought to be taken of our Saviour's divinity. Where, I ask, were the human laws of which Farnese boasts, when in Italy a General Council treated of the essentials of religion, no doubt, after inviting the Roman Bishop, but when no one appeared as his representative? Where, too, when a cause of the greatest moment was carried from Melchiades, the Roman Bishop, to the Bishop of Arles? Donatus of Casa Nigra had a dispute with Cecilianus. It was not a civil matter, but an ecclesiastical cause, and embraced no unimportant articles of Christian doctrine, viz., the Unity of the Church, and the Communion of Saints. Constantine the Great had first made Melchiades judge, but after he had given judgment, the case was carried, on the appeal of Donatus, to the Bishop of Arles. Such is the testimony of Augustine. Why did not Melchiades protest that every thing was wickedly thrown into confusion, when supreme judicial authority was wrested from him? It remains, therefore, for Farnese to show to those who take him for an oracle, that he is Cephas the head.

Digitized by Google

(8.) As if the Emperor had wished the decision to be given according to the caprice of each individual, and not to be taken from the Holy Word of God, after duly weighing both sides of the question! As if, too, he had committed to laics the office of deciding for themselves, and not rather of inquiring into what was taught by the Word of God. If this fact is new to Farnese, he must have very little acquaintance with antiquity.

(9.) If this view of Farnese is adopted, there will be no occasion for a Council. The matter will be quickly dispatched, if those who come forward to give an account of their doctrine are, while the cause is unpleaded, to be declared assertors of damnable heresies. Nor, in sooth, does the most Holy Father act imprudently. For, what more desirable than to slay your enemies with a single word? But there is this inconvenience, that those who are so atrociously condemned nobly and strenuously defend themselves against the calumny, while, at the same time, they charge home upon the Pope himself the guilt not only of impiety, and wickedness of every kind, but prove him to be Antichrist, the head of all the wicked.

(10.) What? Is not good King Josiah eulogised by the Holy Spirit, because, when he saw the offerings consumed by the priests, he appointed his scribe to reckon with them? (2 Kings xii. 10.) Where, then, the sin should Christian princes in the present day, after his example, when they see the resources of the Church engulfed in the whirlpools of the Pope, and shamefully squandered with the greatest villany, put forth their hands to stop the sacrilege? The first question here is, to what use is the property of the Church destined? the second, to whom belongs its administration? and the third, if the ordinary administration is vicious, and calls for thorough correction, by whom is the remedy to be applied? It is on the last of these that the Emperor has promised to take the sense of the States, and we can easily understand what cause Farnese has to make an uproar.

(11.) An epithet must be supplied; for Protestants are

Digitized by Google

out of a church, but it is the Popish Church. They were condemned, but it was without being heard. If, however, it be true, that wherever the pure truth of Christ, together with an entire consent in mind and doctrine with all the godly in Christ, exists, there, too, the real unity of the Church exists, Protestants assuredly are not aliens from the Church.

(12.) Nay, what man, whether prince or private individual, if he has only a spark of Christian zeal, desires not that a state of matters so deplorable should, with all possible dispatch, be relieved? Who does not perceive that it is vain to look for any help from the Pope? He, therefore, who is offended that a remedy so necessary has been sought out by the Emperor, can only betray his own impiety. But it is well he immediately after declares that he was speaking of certain hired slaves.

(13.) I should like to know which of these things is repugnant to the institution of Christ, and to right order in the Church. I know they are said to be so, but by whom? If the devil is the father of lies, who will put any faith in his vicar?

(14.) Truly a strange metamorphosis! The Pope begins to be so religious, that he is horrified when he hears that peace has been made with Protestants. But it is strange, on the other hand, that he quietly bargains with courtesans, and dreads no contamination from the pay of panderism, that he lets the Jews off for an annual pension, permitting them not only with impunity to despise the Christian name, but to commit open robbery by their usury; in fine, that he has no aversion even to the Turks. But his holiness appears, especially in this, that he is afraid, with the Apostle Paul, lest evil communication corrupt good manners. Wicked apostate! Nay, prince of all apostacy! What hast thou to do with the holy sentiment of the Apostle? thou, who, after spending days with villanous advisers in scheming treachery, in coining fraud, in kindling up wars, in devising new kinds of rapine, in plotting the destruction of the innocent, in pulling down the

Digitized by Google

Church, and putting religion to flight, then spendest the rest of thy time with epicures, in sensual indulgence, or amid a tribe of harlots wallow in the mire, neither speaking nor hearing any thing that does not either breathe execrable impiety, or by its obscenity stimulate those vile passions, which, though enfeebled, yet have not altogether ceased to act.

(15.) We must be all attention, for there now seems to be something in his complaint. I admit, indeed, that Church order is so important in the sight of God, that he who invades another's office cannot escape punishment for his temerity.

(16.) If there were any rational ground for preserving the tyranny for which Farnese now contends, the most valid of all would be that no one might dare to interfere with the correction of priests. If, therefore, we concede to Farnese, that it is an unlawful usurpation, that it is great sacrilege for princes, when the Pope is lethargic, and the whole clergy yawning, to attempt to relieve the perishing Church, the question is decided. How does the Emperor exculpate himself from this serious charge? First, although it is not every man's business to engage in removing the corruptions of the Church, and restore it to its proper state, how can this right justly be denied to Christian Princes? Farnese objects, that by so doing they invade the sacerdotal chair. But it always seemed otherwise to the holy Fathers, who held no practice more ancient than for Princes to employ their authority in reducing careless and dishonest priests to order, and in depriving of their dignities such as were unworthy of them. Farnese, therefore, labours under a hallucination, when he does not see how great a difference there is between the two things, between occupying the chair, and appointing proper persons to sit in it, there to rule with reason and justice.

(17.) This much all concede—that order in the Church ought not to be disturbed. The whole question, therefore, depends on the definition of order. Order requires that there be distinct functions. We grant this. But distinction

Digitized by Google

is not inconsistent with union. There is nothing to prevent those who hold different offices from accomplishing many things by common exertions, by jointly rolling the same stone; in a word, nothing to prevent one, in any urgent necessity, from sometimes taking the place of another.

(18.) Let Farnese then grant to us that the state of the Church was ordered according to the will of Christ, and we will readily grant, that whoever presumes to touch it even with his little finger, with the view of uprooting it, is chargeable with impious audacity. But, since that barbarian, or rather brute-like confusion of the Papacy, is far remote from the holy rule of Christ, have done with this misapplication of the term "Divine Providence," to which a grievous insult is offered, when it is erroneously and impudently employed to cloak a tyranny, utterly at variance with the kingdom of Christ.

(19.) Uzzah was punished because he presumed to put forth his hand to the ark of God, from well-intentioned but inconsiderate zeal, namely, by taking upon him the duty of the priests, while they were standing near and ready to perform it. Where now, among the whole Popish clergy, is there one priest who is intent on supporting the ark of the Lord? Uzzah was punished, because, both at variance with his vocation, and against the clear prohibition of God, he broke through and touched the ark. Where the interdict of God, where the strictly defined vocation, which debars the Emperor from caring for the Church? Isaiah calls upon all kings to undertake that care, (Is. xlix. 23.) Uzzah was punished, because, prematurely, with unseasonable fervour, he rushed in to support the ark. But how different the case, when David, finding the ark lying on the ground covered with mire, exposed to the affronts of the ungodly, attempts to raise it up, and issues an edict, calling upon the priests to bring it up to its place. But how dare a harpy like you order others to remove their hands from the ark! —you, who, after throwing it down with your impure beak, are ignominiously trampling it under your feet? Can it be lawful for you to fill the ark of God with abominations, to

Digitized by Google

profane it with the greatest contumely, to prostitute it to any mockery of Satan, to rend it into pieces, and insult its sanctity; and must it be impious for Princes, and the whole Christian people, to cleanse away its impurities, to replace its parts, and draw near to put it in repair?

(20.) What will not this madman dare, who is not ashamed to compare himself to Moses and Aaron? He says that Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, came to a fearful end, because they murmured against the priests of the Lord. But in what is it that you resemble Moses? Are you a priest of the Lord, you who put every thing sacred to flight? Jehu not only stirred up a tumult against the priests of Baal, but pursuing them sword in hand, slew the whole of them in the temple of their idol, (2 Kings x. 25.) A noble deed, approved by the testimony of God! Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, wounded Moses only with their tongue, and the earth swallowed them alive. Be you, therefore, different from what you are, before you debar princes from assailing you, by claiming the rights and honours of the priesthood.

(21.) The priesthood of Aaron "served a shadow," but contained within it no vain emblem of the truth, and was founded on the sacred authority of God. But does the Pope exhibit any thing except a mask? On what foundation does his tyranny lean? In fine, by whose authority, from the highest to the least, are priests initiated in their sacrilegious function by a magical rather than a Christian rite? Do their utmost, they will never support the kind of priesthood on which they plume themselves by a single syllable of Scripture.

(22.) A perverse custom is nothing more than an ancient error. But, at any rate, who will admit it to be a custom of the church, that those who have the name of prelates, be their characters and conduct what they may, though there is nothing they less resemble than the name they bear, may go about as they list, devouring the flock of Christ, while no man must dare to oppose their robbery? In what Barbary, pray, could this custom prevail, that banditti, under the protection of a name, might with impunity,

Digitized by Google

and without restriction, destroy, kill, waste, and squander, and whenever any one uttered a whisper about curbing their villany, might raise a clamour, and accuse him of confounding things sacred and profane?

(23.) When these three things have been made clear, viz., *first*, That the Emperor has undertaken the reformation of the Church, not from necessity, but from presumption; *secondly*, That the Church has been committed to priests in such a sense, that all whose hands are not anointed are kept aloof from it, just as from offering incense; and, *thirdly*, That the Papal priesthood, equally with the Levitical, has its origin from God, the example of Uzzah will perhaps apply to the present case. On the other hand, if none of these things is clear, and it can be readily evinced that the Emperor had no alternative but to interfere, unless he was willing, while in perfect knowledge, to wink at the destruction of the Church, and that nothing was more appropriate to his character, whereas the Papal priesthood is consecrated by nothing better than sacrilege and anathema, what support does the example of Uzzah give to Farnese? Let him, I say, show that the power of convening a Council, and of restoring the Church to its true condition, is committed to priests alone, like the burning of incense, but is forbidden to kings. Here truth openly remonstrates. Let him show that the Emperor causelessly interferes, and while matters are well arranged, is led on merely by ambition, or a depraved love of change. Let him show that the Emperor has thrust aside the lawful priest, and is violently seizing upon an altar interdicted to him. But where is the priest who stands ready to perform the duty? Where the barriers by which the pious solicitude of the Emperor is excluded, so that it must not break through; and where the temerity or licentiousness of attempting a work, which to decline would be at once the greatest heartlessness and perfidy?

It may be worth while here to notice the acute reasoning of Farnese's scribe. To enact laws concerning religion is, he says, sacrifice, and sacrifice most acceptable to God; and, therefore, it is altogether inconsistent with the Emperor's

Digitized by Google

office. This, however, is not to argue, but to throw everything into confusion, as swine do. For what is it to give alms? What to devote one's self to the public good? What to confine the people to the pure worship of God? What, in fine, to dedicate ourselves to God? Are not these, too, sacrifices, and sacrifices of a sweet and grateful odour? And yet they are common to all the pious. And, moreover, what babbling to say that the enacting of laws respecting religion is a thing pleasing to God, when Scripture proclaims it to be the offspring of diabolical presumption! It is the duty of Cæsar, and of all mankind, to listen to only one Legislator, in every thing which pertains to the internal government of the soul, and to submit, without exception, to all the laws which he has decreed.

(24.) Not contented with the common prerogative of priests, Farnese mounts an eminence of his own—"Ours," says he, "in particular." By what right?—because to us has been given the power of binding and loosing. What, then, to others? for it was said at the same time to all the apostles, "Whatsoever ye shall bind." That which Christ communicates to all will you, with predatory violence, seize for yourself? Will you strip the Church naked, that you may clothe yourself in her spoils?

(25.) Truly an excellent privilege—that priests may rush with impunity into all kinds of wickedness, and judgment be left to God alone. But if it be so, to what end that ancient discipline of the clergy, which, though now existing only on paper, once was practised in the Church? When bishops assume to themselves the sole right of passing judgment on priests, they endeavour, after the manner of the giants, to push God from his seat. But such permission has been given to bishops. Where? If God has claimed it for himself alone, are not you, in transferring it to priests, just making them gods? Is not this, too, wondrously acute? "I will require it of pastors," saith the Lord; therefore, cognisance belongs only to God, and no man may lawfully assume it, even for a time. What? does not the Lord also require the blood of the innocent at the hand of murderers? Does not

Digitized by Google

he require thefts, rapine, and all injuries whatsoever? Does he not require of the wicked all the wickedness which they may have perpetrated? Therefore, (according to this drivelling logic of Farnese,) let judgment be abolished, let the punishment of crimes cease; for judgment must be left to God alone. Surely this judgment of God alone is not over priests only, but over all men, whatever be their station. And why are princes called gods, but just because judgment has been committed to them?

(26.) What angel, or rather what demon, revealed this to Farnese? Since the judgments of God proceed on various grounds, who can, at his own hand, determine the particular ground? Solomon certainly denies that human intellect can discern when it is that God visits in love, and when in hatred, saying, that "all things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked," (Eccles. ix. 2.) The fact must, therefore, be determined by the Word of God; but Farnese remembers well whose person he represents. For, on one occasion, the devil, whom he serves, thus stipulated with Christ, "All these will I give you, if you will fall down and worship me." So also Farnese's predecessors. When we served the Queen of heaven, "then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil," (Jer. xliv. 17.) But let us now hear the rewards which he affirms to have been conferred for worshipping his See, and the punishments inflicted for contempt of it.

(27.) He adduces Constantine the Great, with the view of making us give credit to the fictitious donation of which he boasts. So shameless is he, that silly tales, which even children now laugh at, he hesitates not to obtrude on the Emperor as sure oracles. Once, indeed, the foolish Canonists with solemn brow prated of this figment, but there is no longer any room for such absurdities. On what account, moreover, does he make Theodosius to be so faithful a worshipper of his See? Though that Emperor paid singular respect to Ambrose, it is no where read that he ever held in estimation either the Roman Chair, or those who sat in it. It is certainly strange, that Farnese did not add Trajan to

Digitized by Google

his list! Then, what kind of pretext has he for referring the victories of Charlemagne to one superstition or crafty design, viz., his exaltation of the seat of abomination? When out of the many heroic and memorable acts of Charlemagne he singles out this fault, he just does as those do who among gold gather nothing but dross.

(28.) Who would not say, that the barking of this impure dog should be put down by sticks and stones rather than words, when he ascribes the Divine vengeance inflicted on Justinian, not to the manifest impiety which he displayed in supporting the Eutychian heresy, but solely to his contumacy in impairing the majesty of the Roman See? Anastasius, too, impugns the orthodox faith. He is professedly the favourer and assertor of an execrable blasphemy against Christ. He does what in him lies to overturn a pious and salutary doctrine concerning the mystery of incarnation. He disturbs the whole Church, and dismembers it by pernicious dissensions. At length, struck by lightning, he comes to a miserable end. Farnese pronounces the sole cause of his death to be his rebellion against Gelasius and Hormisdas. Does any man believe it?

(29.) Mauritius, now an old man, after he had held the empire for twenty years, is insidiously and most perfidiously assassinated by Phocas, one of his soldiers. Farnese, as if he had been present at the counsels of God, interprets this death to have been a punishment for contempt of the Roman See. It were to be wished, indeed, that a Prince, otherwise quiet and peaceful, had not mixed himself up with the depraved factions of the bishops, or had chosen to repress rather than to favour the ambition of John. But the question should be, why did Gregory then ask, not why would Mauritius not permit, that any one should be regarded as universal bishop, since this title was, as he says, nefarious, iniquitous, profane, abominable, and the forerunner of Antichrist? But, to pass over this too, where is the equity of Farnese, when, in speaking of a Prince who was villanously murdered, he condemns him merely because he did not show himself obsequious to the Roman See, and lauds a parricide,

Digitized by Google

who drew his sword against a master from whom he had received the greatest kindness, and thus by perfidy, and an abominable crime, obtained the empire; lauds him because he showed greater willingness to deck the Roman idol and exalt its power? And yet what other object had Phocas in all his largesses to the Romish See, than to purchase, as by nefarious paction, the favour of the city of Rome, because he knew that he was deservedly detested by the Greeks?

(30.) It is strange that when the pay is so good, Farnese does not procure more learned scribes. For what ignorance of history does it betray, first, to blunder shamefully in the names, setting down Constans for Justinian; and, secondly, while all the Greek Emperors were in the same condition, to mention it as the condition only of a few? But, perhaps, this is artfully done, because he could not find in others any punishment which he might employ as a bugbear.

(31.) The vices of Henry's character it is not necessary here to extenuate. But if it be inquired, what were the seeds of contention between him and Hildebrand, and in what way the strife was conducted, it will assuredly be found that Hildebrand, a man of a crafty and malicious temper, inflamed with an insatiable ambition, and possessing, moreover, both the confidence and excessive cruelty of a gladiator, seeing Henry dissipating himself in luxury, and while abandoned to his passions, still haughty and ferocious, adopted the resolution of dismembering the empire. By what engines, then, did he assail Henry? What arm did he use to the very last, in order to crush him? Having absolved the German Princes from their allegiance, *i. e.*, granted them a licence to commit perjury, influenced some by false terrors, intimidated others by menaces, corrupted others by flattery, and amused the Elector of Bavaria with the hopes of the empire, suddenly, with intestine war, as with one great conflagration, he set all Germany in a blaze. When Henry suppliantly approached and threw himself prostrate before him, he spurned him with the utmost haughtiness. And he set no bounds to his passionate and intolerable pride, until he had both the Emperor and the empire at his feet. It

Digitized by Google

seemed a small matter only to have Cæsar for his vassal. He must also, after destroying the empire, be sole tyrant. And yet Farnese has the hardihood to make mention of a history which clearly testifies, or rather is an indubitable proof, that never, out of the infernal regions, did there exist monsters so foul, as that their foulness is not surpassed by the flagitiousness of the Roman See.

(32.) Why did he not also put Frederick I. into his list? Nay, why did he not frame a long catalogue of emperors? The more mildly any emperor conducted himself, the more arrogantly the Roman Antichrists took advantage of his disposition, making no scruple of shamefully insulting him, while any, who, with somewhat more spirit, withstood their insolence, were made to feel what it was to provoke the rage of furious beasts. It being clear that your predecessors, Farnese, insulted the Cæsars, and that, for the most part, without provocation, by their more than unbridled lust, their more than a tyrant's cruelty, and their ungovernable fury, will you, too, presume to charge our Emperor as guilty before God, because he has not allowed himself to be trampled upon by savage beasts? Is it thus, impious man, you would make God at once the supporter and minister of your iniquity?

(33.) I indeed admit that dire vengeance from God impends over all who make it their endeavour to violate the unity of the Church. But what greater violation of unity, than when purity of doctrine is adulterated, and agreement in it destroyed, and Christ, in consequence, torn as it were to pieces? And who, Farnese, but yourself, is the author and high priest of this dismemberment? I know it is not your fault that we do not all preach one head upon earth, one Roman See, as Mother and Queen; but whose fault is it but yours that we do not all from the heart confess one God and one faith, as we have all one baptism? But why do you call that the Principal See, which, destitute now for above eight hundred years of a true bishop, first gave a place to dead images, and is at this day occupied by a leader in im-

Digitized by Google

piety, a most cruel tyrant of souls, an inveterate enemy of Christ, a prime devastator of the Church?

(34.) There cannot be the least doubt that the Jews are suffering merited punishment for despising and opposing Christ. The Greeks, too, are oppressed by a cruel and miserable bondage, but the cause is obscure, if we do not search for it in the Word of God. Farnese conjectures it has happened because of their rebellion against the Holy See. If I may conjecture, I would rather suppose it to have happened because they carried their pride to such a height, that they were the first to aspire to that tyranny over the whole Church which the Pope now usurps; because, from excessive fondness for novelty, they broke down into various sects, and because, from depraved ambition to signalise themselves by something better than the sacred institutions of Christ, they degenerated from the pure standard of the Gospel. Which of these two conjectures is the more probable? It is certain that the faults which I assign as the cause are condemned by the judgment of God. But if men are to be listened to, while, out of their own brain, they invent any kind of causes, with no less plausibility might the Greeks, while the power and majesty of their empire were unimpaired, have upbraided the Romans with suffering the punishment of their rebellion, for having resisted the See of Constantinople in the dispute concerning the primacy; although, as I observed, when that dispute was first agitated, the Roman Bishop did not aspire to primacy, but only maintained that his own place was not inferior to that of the Bishop of Constantinople.

In one word, Farnese would fain persuade us, that the only sin in the world deserving of the Divine wrath, deserving of all punishments, in short, the source of all evil, is, that all men do not show obsequiousness to him, do not hang upon his nod, do not worship him as a God. Who but a madman will allow himself to be persuaded of this? But were all men disposed to believe it, it is incumbent on him first, to show what similar demerits the Hungarians have, whose condition is in no respect better than that of the

Digitized by Google

Greeks. Explain to us, I say, by what fault of theirs the Hungarians have been brought into the same servitude with the Greeks, though you have always abused them as if they had been the vilest bondmen, and they, just like slaves confined in their workshops, and working in chains, have resisted none of your commands.

How childishly then you trifle, when, as if it were a settled point, you haughtily declare that the tyranny of your See was never spurned with impunity? But it is certain that Christ was not slightly moved at the contempt shown to his vicegerent! How dare you, with polluted lips, thus insult Christ? First, Who exalted you to this honour? For, as an Apostle declares, no man ought to assume honour to himself, (Heb. v. 4.) It was said to Peter, "Feed my sheep," (John xxi. 17.) True, but the same thing was said to all. That ancient smoke, by which you were wont to blind the eyes of men, has long since vanished away. With what face, then, dare you arrogate to yourself so proud a title—a title which, were any angel to claim, he would deserve to be anathematised? In the opinion of Gregory, (your predecessor, as you boast,) any man who should make himself universal Bishop, were he Roman or not, was wicked, impious, sacrilegious, the vicar of Satan, and the forerunner of Antichrist. You must, therefore, either condemn Gregory as a blasphemer of your See, or bear the burden of his heavy sentence.

But now, to spare this execrable blasphemy, let us assume that the doctrine which Cyprian teaches, on the authority of the Apostles and Prophets, is false, viz., that there is one bishoprick in the Church of Christ, part of which bishoprick each bishop holds entire; and let us grant that that supremacy is transferred to some one individual, by what right, or semblance of right, can it be claimed by one so desperately abandoned as you? You, the successor of Peter! you, who have no more resemblance to him than any Nero, or Domitian, or Caligula! But, perhaps you would rather have me name Heliogabalus, who added to the empire a new priesthood. All these emperors were unques-

Digitized by Google

tionably high priests in name, for the superstition of the time so allowed, but you now usurp the name among a Christian people, contrary to law and justice, contrary to the inviolable decree of Christ, and contrary to the injunctions of all the holy Fathers. You, the vicegerent of Christ! you, whose every thought, and wish, and action, are directed to the extinction of Christ, provided only the empty name remain, with which, as with a meretricious glare, you may deceive us! You, the vicegerent of Christ, whom now the very children all know to be very Antichrist! What kind of Christ will you fabricate for us, if you wish his image to be represented in your tyranny? We see a high priest of all impiety, a standard-bearer of Satan, a fierce tyrant, a cruel murderer of souls, in short, the son of perdition, whom the Apostle describes; and must we regard him as the vicegerent of Christ? We see, I say, the wolf by which the sheep of Christ are devoured, we see the thief by whom they are carried off, we see the prowler by whom they are slain, and still must we esteem him the vicegerent of Christ?

(35.) Themistocles, when about to offer a sacrifice to justice, is said to have exclaimed, "O goddess, if thou any where exist!" When the Pope calls his conscience as a witness, must we not ask where it exists? Orators sometimes call up from the infernal regions those whose personal presence they judge appropriate to their cause, but there is no room for this in the case of the Pope, for whom there is neither a heaven nor a hell. It is only for him, then, who holds this chimera in his hands, to believe that Farnese will cheerfully shed his blood for the peace of the Church. But if we look to the fact, we will find that though Paul Farnese knows what it is to shed the blood of others, he has learned to spare his own. Certainly, if it could have been believed up to this time, that there was a particle of conscience still remaining in a Pope, his manifest perjury, in this instance, would make it clear how completely he has shaken himself free both from fear of God and regard for man.

Digitized by Google

(36.) An equitable provision doubtless, that the Protestants shall be given up to the Pope for judgment! Why? For he says he is their judge. Sole judge? He assumes at his Council, as co-adjutors, his own venerable brethren, whom he also besprinkles with a portion of honour! Is it that the flock of sheep may be delivered to as many wolves? Whatever their character be, they are the persons to take cognisance! If on one occasion Paul was entitled to say, "I wist not, brethren, that it was the high priest," what are we entitled in the present day to say of these fierce vultures? In one word, I would only say, let them show themselves to be the Lord's priests, and I will, without difficulty, concede to them a power of judging. But seeing plainly what they are, I am entitled again and again to ask who appointed them judges or rulers?

(37.) The honourable title which the Holy Spirit bestows on princes and civil magistrates, (as is evident, both from the passage itself, and also from the interpretation of Christ,) Constantine, who was not well read in the Scriptures, and if history speaks true, was then a catechumen, transferred by mistake to the priests. Farnese thinks, that in calling in its aid, he has found the shield of Achilles. The point, then, to be determined is, to which of the two we are to give credit, to God or Constantine, in interpreting the passage, "I said ye are gods?" At the same time, I admit that when Constantine saw the Bishops inflamed with a kind of deadly rage, lacerating each other, sparing Arius, and deserting the cause of Christ, in order that they might indulge their own passions, he acted prudently in refusing to have any thing to do with their libels. But how far Constantine was from being of Farnese's mind, and how false Farnese is in sheltering himself under his name, may easily be judged from his letter to the Nicomedians, as given in the First Book of Theodoret. "If," says he, "we have chaste, orthodox, and modest bishops, we rejoice. But if any one shall unadvisedly and presumptuously employ himself in fomenting disturbances, his presumption must be checked by the servant of God, *i. e.*, by my executive

Digitized by Google

authority." Since Farnese wishes our Emperor Charles to make Constantine in all respects his model, he cannot object to allow, not merely his presumption, but his unbridled rage, to be curbed by his hand.

(38.) It is true Farnese has sometimes made a show of calling a Council; but any one who believes that he ever thought seriously of holding a Council, has not a particle of soundness in his brain. He knows that the world, as if famishing, has long been gaping eagerly for a Council, and he knows that all accuse him of extreme cruelty, in so long dragging out the time by endless evasions. Why not, then, when it can cost him nothing, satisfy the ignorant by now and then summoning a Council? If any man wonder why the Pope is so much afraid of a Council, though no good man will find a place in it, let him hence consider how monstrous a species of tyranny that must be, which can only be maintained in fear and terror.

(39.) Here we see what it is that alarms the most holy Father. He does not wish the cause of the Protestants to be managed in the way of hearing and discussing, but thinks the most convenient plan would be to begin by condemning them; although, indeed, he will scarcely honour them so far as to begin anew to take up a cause which he has already decided, but will order the sentence already passed to be executed. And, certainly, he does not consult ill for his own schemes, when he anxiously avoids the discussion of a cause so full of doubt and peril to himself. What, then, is left to the Protestants, even were audience allowed them, but to abandon their defence, and yield up to him their persons and their all?

(40.) It were, indeed, desirable that all the Germans would sincerely unite in adopting a pure faith, and cling together under one common head, namely, Christ; nay, that the whole world could be brought to this unity, so accomplishing that which undoubtedly constitutes the true perfection of the Church, forming one sheepfold under one Shepherd. But the Pope objects, because it is nothing to him that one God be acknowledged by all, and the whole

Digitized by Google

world governed by the pure doctrine and under the auspices of Christ, if he himself is not adored as head. Therefore, although he who has no God cannot, without falsehood, call God to witness, still, lest you should suppose that he is always false, there is one thing which he here affirms truly, viz., that there is nothing he more longs for, than to bring back under his yoke all those who have thrown it off, and whom he regards as incorrigible.

(41.) As if he had called the Council with any hope of assembling it, and had not rather intentionally selected the time which would be most unsuitable for a peaceful consultation. When he was well aware that the two principal monarchs of the Christian world were kept asunder by war, and that in several places the trumpet for battle was almost sounding, then he pretended that he wished to hold a Council. Who will believe he was such a fool as to hope for it? Hence, one may easily conjecture that he never acts without dissimulation. For how came it to pass that he abandoned it when affairs were tranquil? After making a fluster for some time with summoning a Council, first to meet at Mantua, and afterwards at Verona, both of them vanished into a Bull; and now, in unsettled times, amidst the sound of arms, he bestirs himself as if he had found the fittest opportunity!

(42.) O abandoned impudence! It is strange, that, during the writing of this passage, he did not order his scribe to groan and squeeze one little tear from his left eye. But he is not less foolish than dishonest in acting this play before the Emperor, as if the Emperor did not know him. Let him, therefore, look out for a stranger. And yet where will he find one, though he search from east to west, who does not know that he cheats both God and man? But to proceed, to what place does he summon the Council?—to Trent. He will be clever, indeed, if he finds the Germans so silly, as of their own accord to throw themselves into the wolves' jaws. How will the Council be composed? Of Milesians, beyond a doubt, who cannot bear even the shadow of a good man among them. What equity or modera-

Digitized by Google

tion in conducting the investigation? Perhaps they will come, honest and unbiassed by prejudice, to calm and pious deliberation. Nay, Farnese even now says that the cause which is to be brought under discussion is already condemned. It would be superfluous, therefore, to spend one little hour in discussing it. However, not to seem too stern or too cruel, they will gravely set themselves to hear—"Go, officer, call the Protestants; if they desire to propose anything to the Council, let them give the substance of it in an humble petition, that they may not offend the delicate ears of the holy Fathers." Having heard the demands of the petitioners, it will be convenient, first of all, to ascertain whether they concede to the holy Fathers, without challenge, the power of judging them and their doctrine; and, next, whether, abandoning the reformation which they have established, and abjuring the doctrine which they have embraced, they are prepared to reinstate, as before their banishment, the faith and all the ritual of the holy Roman See. If they hesitate as to the former, they will immediately be declared schismatics; if they refuse to do the latter, they will be twice heretics. It will, therefore, be necessary to determine forthwith how their contumacy is to be punished. For it will be unlawful to touch a single matter, unless the Church is restored out and out. Meanwhile, the Christian world being distracted by a civil war persecuting and oppressing the Protestants, the reformation of the Church will be delayed. The venerable clergy, however, will not be idle. There will everywhere be need of many bellows to blow the fire. But after they have once returned to tranquil possession, should any one dare to make any farther mention of convening a Council, he will be proclaimed by all with one mouth a turbulent, a seditious fellow, and an enemy of unity. It is certain, according to Farnese's view, even the Emperor himself could not attempt it with impunity. Let leave, however, be granted to the Emperor to petition for a Council, still it will be free to the Pope to refuse; and having met with a refusal, let him beware of going a step farther, un-

Digitized by Google

less he wishes to suffer the punishment of his presumption after the manner of Uzzah, or to come to some other dreadful end. Of the ordering of the Council I will speak by and by, if I find time.

(43.) Who can now wonder that the Pope claims primacy over every description of mortals, since he here makes himself the president of angels also? But I fear I may have been misled by an ambiguity in the name. I certainly have been mistaken. For what angels could he mean, except those whom he has always been accustomed to use as counsellors? Among them is the one who of old was a lying spirit in the mouth of all the prophets to destroy Ahab. If one could do so much there, what will some thousands do here? For this, however, Farnese is justly liable to censure,—in sending to the under benches those who are to preside over the Council, and sit higher than its chair. For not even is he himself so great a god, as not to be the servant of the father of lies. Certainly, one who subjects his person and his life to magical divinations, is by acknowledgment less than the devil whom he invokes. Still, I care not what he professes, when I see what it is he does.

(44.) He is a father, and such a father as the poets describe Saturn to have been, one who devours his children. Whoever will not obey what he says, he excludes from the number of the children of God. But it is well that his thunder is Salmonean, not divine.

(45.) The first point here is, that no doctrine shall be received that does not proceed from the tripod of the Roman See. Having obtained this, how can there remain any ground for dispute? Accordingly, he does not object to discussion concerning doctrine, and the purifying and reforming of the Church, provided he sits judge, and the whole controversy is decided by his nod. Not contented, however, with this, he takes another precaution, allowing those things only to be taken into consideration which he and his cohort of angels choose, prescribing the mode of pleading, imposing silence as often as he pleases, and when-

Digitized by Google

ever his stamp is heard, making all tremble. Is it so? Protestants complain that the worship of God is corrupted, his glory extinguished, or, at least, greatly obscured, the kingdom of Christ overturned, religion adulterated, the doctrine of truth partly vitiated, partly buried, the Church miserably torn and wasted, the sacraments prostituted to a vile and shameful gain, souls redeemed by the blood of Christ made the subject of a sacrilegious trafficking, and the ministry or pastoral office, than which nothing ought to be more salutary to the world, converted into a deadly tyranny. They charge the Pope and his adherents with the guilt of all these evils, and they are prepared to demonstrate, as with the finger, that he is Antichrist. They decline not, should the proof fail, not only to bear the penalty of calumny, but all punishments, however severe. All that they demand is audience before a fair tribunal, and audience on the condition that the cause be determined according to the sacred Word of God, yet without disregarding the ancient customs of the Fathers. What says the most Holy Father to this? He, indeed, allows cognisance, but on the terms which I have stated. But this is just the same as if a robber, when accused of the robbery and murder committed by him, were to say that he does not refuse to be judged, but on the condition that the tribunal shall be erected by himself, that he from it shall pronounce judgment in his own cause, that nothing shall be advanced against his will, that nothing offensive to him shall be uttered, that he shall be pressed by no evidence, but shall so regulate the whole pleading of the cause, that he may without any molestation secure impunity for his crimes. Here we see the reason why Imperial Diets are not competent to hear this cause.

(46.) The second point relates to ecclesiastical revenues, and then the doctrine maintained is, that if hitherto there has been any vice in the administration of them, if any illicit usurpation, it can only be corrected by the judgment of the Pope. Who can doubt that the Pope has reasons for insisting upon this? For what access would be given to

Digitized by Google

Princes to make innovations, were they admitted here? We know what unrestrained luxury prevails in the present day among Bishops, Abbots, and those who follow in their train. Princes might hear that the wealth which is now so shamefully dilapidated is the patrimony of the poor, and then who would not rise against these squanderers, did they not anticipate interference by forcing themselves into order? Princes might learn from the ancient Canons what the distribution should be, and to whom it belongs, and they might in consequence insist on restoring the ancient deaconship. They might hear that no man should be supported out of the revenues of the Church who does not fulfil his function, and they might therefore proclaim, that all lazy bellies are to be discarded. Were this done, how few out of the many legions would remain? What Bishop in the present day performs his duty, nay, pretends to perform it? What Parson does? Hence Canons and others might be brought back to the old form of Presbytery. Then this profane, that is, as they term it, lay correction, might not only travel to other churches, but might find its way to the hitherto inaccessible See of Rome itself. What else would this be than to confound heaven and earth? Would it not be a criminal indignity to the terrestrial god, that his rule of life should be dictated, that the expense of his table should be prescribed, that his accounts should be annually called for? And not only so, but whatever he has seized from others by unjust violence, or stolen by fraud, might be wrested from him. Nay, more, he might be forced to restore what he pillaged from the empire, and possesses as of right; in short, to disgorge all the rapine which he has engulfed during so many years.

Still, if any greater necessity required it, all this might be conceded. But now, why should the Princes invade another's office when so equitable a method is here prescribed by Farnese? For who is better fitted to effect a cure than he who has a thorough knowledge of the disease? The corruptions which entirely put an end to the ancient

Digitized by Google

deaconship must be cleared out and removed! On whom is it fitter that this office should be imposed, than on those who are not only aware of the evils, but also the authors of them? Let us wait and see what kind of amendment will take place, if free power be left to the priests, either to act or refrain from acting. Not thus good King Josiah, who charged his scribe not only with the revenue destined for maintenance, but also with the sacred offerings. And yet Farnese is not ashamed to accuse the States of the Empire of sacrilege, if they interfere to check his sacrilege.

(47.) To what the concession made to the Protestants amounts I need not here explain, though in substance it comes to this, that they are not to be prematurely oppressed by unjust prejudices, until their cause has been duly investigated and judged. His Holiness orders all this to be rescinded. The thing, at first sight, seems harsh, but there is a reason under. For what if Protestants should come to the Council in possession of all their rights? Would not the Holy See be injured were discussion to be entered upon as if matters were doubtful? Therefore, it is not without cause the Pope contends so strenuously that they shall not have the benefit of any privilege. For what more convenient for him, or more expeditious, than that they should be dragged thither, as felons, or pay the penalty of their absence? There can be no doubt, therefore, as to the expediency, but we ask, is it just and right? Farewell honesty, says Farnese; let utility prevail. This, indeed, is the usual course of Roman justice; but he forgets that he is speaking in Germany, where the faith, once pledged, is religiously observed, and there is some sense of shame. In Germany, I say, it is new and unusual to break promises, to resile from solemn obligations, and regard nothing as firmly ratified, except in so far as conducive to self-interest. But, if it is abhorrent from the common custom of Germany to count a promise as nothing, and retract it at pleasure, what more alien to the character of its Emperor?

The conclusion is, that whatever stipulations the Emperor has made with the Protestants, whatever transacted

Digitized by Google

and determined, must be declared null and void. True, among men there is nothing holier than faith; but it was long ago decreed that faith is not to be kept with heretics. But, if an oath has been interposed? As if it did not belong to Pontiffs to loose from an oath as often as they see fit! But it is a perpetual and inviolable law of the empire, that what is promised must be performed. What then? Is not the Pope superior to laws? Nay, what are laws to him? But is it not unworthy of the majesty of the Emperor to abandon his decree? It is enough that all turpitude is wiped away by the sanctity of the Pope. But the deed has been executed. As if the absolution of the Pope did not suffice for nullifying all deeds. Thus, indeed, he was wont to act in former times. Of this we have a signal proof in the case of John Huss, whom the Romans, after alluring him to Constance by a safe-conduct, cruelly murdered. The Emperor Sigismund, a prince of a mild, and by no means a sanguinary temper, was present. When he, thinking it most disgraceful both to himself and the whole empire, that an individual whom he had taken under his power and protection should, in his presence, and so actually under his protection, be hurried off to die by the executioner, earnestly interceded to prevent the barbarous cruelty, the decree was framed by the holy Fathers, that faith is not to be kept with heretics. By this the conscience of the Emperor was set free from the oath, while he was ridiculed for his simplicity and bashfulness, in fearing that any disgrace could still accrue to him from violating, or at least neglecting his faith.

But we are now in another age. The world, which was then blind, has opened its eyes. In the minds of the Germans there still resides a remembrance of the foul act, warning them to beware of ever again joining themselves as associates in Roman perfidy. More especially, there is an Emperor who will never be induced to bring his faith and dignity into bondage to Farnese. It is known how oft he has been urged to cruelty by that Satan, and what bellows have been blown to kindle him into flame. He has, how-

Digitized by Google

ever, stood firm to his purpose, and among his many noble and heroic virtues, the one worthiest of all admiration is, that, during these commotions of the empire, he has never allowed himself to be turned aside, either from moderation and clemency, or from a religious regard to his word.

Digitized by Google

AN ADMONITION,

SHOWING THE

ADVANTAGES WHICH CHRISTENDOM MIGHT DERIVE

FROM AN

INVENTORY OF RELICS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ADMONITION,

IN WHICH IT IS SHOWN HOW ADVANTAGEOUS IT WOULD BE FOR CHRISTENDOM THAT THE BODIES AND RELICS OF SAINTS WERE REDUCED TO A KIND OF INVENTORY, INCLUDING THOSE WHICH ARE SAID TO EXIST, AS WELL IN ITALY AS IN FRANCE, GERMANY, SPAIN, AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

AUGUSTINE, in his work, entitled, On the Labour of Monks, complaining of certain itinerant impostors, who, as early as his day, plied a vile and sordid traffic, by carrying the relics of martyrs about from place to place, adds, "If, indeed, they are relics of martyrs." By this expression, he intimates the prevalence, even in his day, of abuses and impostures, by which the ignorant populace were cheated into the belief, that bones gathered here and there were those of saints. While the origin of the imposture is thus ancient, there cannot be a doubt that in the long period which has since elapsed, it has exceedingly increased, considering, especially, that the world has since been strangely corrupted, and has never ceased to become worse, till it has reached the extreme wherein we now behold it. But the first abuse, and, as it were, beginning of the evil, was, that when Christ ought to have been sought in his Word, sacraments, and spiritual influences, the world, after its wont, clung to his garments, vests, and swaddling-clothes; and thus overlooking the principal matter, followed only its accessory. The same course was pursued in regard to

Digitized by Google

apostles, martyrs, and other saints. For when the duty was to meditate diligently on their lives, and engage in imitating them, men made it their whole study to contemplate and lay up, as it were in a treasury, their bones, shirts, girdles, caps, and similar trifles.

I am not unaware that in this there is a semblance of pious zeal, the allegation being, that the relics of Christ are kept on account of the reverence which is felt for himself, and in order that the remembrance of him may take a firmer hold of the mind. And the same thing is alleged with regard to the saints. But attention should be paid to what Paul says, viz., that all divine worship of man's devising, having no better and surer foundation than his own opinion, be its semblance of wisdom what it may, is mere vanity and folly. Besides, any advantage, supposed to be derived from it, ought to be contrasted with the danger. In this way it would be discovered, that the possession of such relics was of little use, or was altogether superfluous and frivolous, whereas, on the other hand, it was most difficult, or rather impossible, that men should not thereby degenerate into idolatry. For they cannot look upon them, or handle them, without veneration; and there being no limit to this, the honour due to Christ is forthwith paid to them. In short, a longing for relics is never free from superstition, nay, what is worse, it is the parent of idolatry, with which it is very generally conjoined.

All admit, without dispute, that God carried away the body of Moses from human sight, lest the Jewish nation should fall into the abuse of worshipping it. What was done in the case of one ought to be extended to all, since the reason equally applies. But not to speak of saints, let us see what Paul says of Christ himself. He declares, that after the resurrection of Christ he knew him no more after the flesh, intimating by these words, that every thing carnal which belonged to Christ should be consigned to oblivion and discarded, in order that we may make it our whole study and endeavour to seek and possess him in spirit. Now, therefore, when men talk of it as a grand

Digitized by Google

thing to possess some memorial of Christ and his saints, what else is it than to seek an empty cloak with which to hide some foolish desire that has no foundation in reason? But even should there seem to be a sufficient reason for it, yet, seeing it is so clearly repugnant to the mind of the Holy Spirit, as declared by the mouth of Paul, what more do we require?

But it is not at all necessary to enter into a long discussion of the point, whether or not it is a good thing to have relics merely for preservation, and not for worship; for, as we have said, experience teaches that the one is never separated from the other. Ambrose, indeed, speaking of Helena, (the mother of Constantine,) who had at great labour and expense procured the cross of our Lord, says, that she did not adore the wood, but only the Lord, who had hung upon it. But it is most rare for persons to be at all devoted to relics, without being also polluted by some degree of superstition. I admit that they do not, at the very outset, break out into open idolatry, but that gradually, from one fallacy to another, they move along their downward path, until they at last rush headlong. Indeed, people, calling themselves Christian, have gone to such lengths as to exhibit the madness of idolatry in a degree equal to that of the heathen of old. For they have prostrated themselves, and bent the knee before relics as before God, lighting torches and tapers as in solemn worship, putting confidence in them, and fleeing to them as if they possessed a divine power and grace. If idolatry is just to transfer the honour of God to others, can we deny that this is idolatry? It is no excuse to say it is done through the excessive zeal of rude and ignorant men or old women. The extravagance is of wider extent. It has everywhere prevailed, and been approved even by those who sit holding the reins of government in the Church. Nay, the bones of the dead, and all other sorts of relics, have been placed over the principal altars in the high and lofty place to be adored with greater reverence. See how what was at first a foolish curiosity for preserving and treasuring up relics, has at

Digitized by Google

length degenerated into such abomination, that men have not only turned away from God, in order to cleave to things vain and perishing, but even with execrable sacrilege to adore things void of sense, instead of Him who liveth, and is blessed for evermore.

But as evil leads on to evil, another unhappy consequence was, that vile objects, out of number, and altogether devoid of sense and beauty, were received as relics of Christ and the Saints. So blind was the world, that, under whatever name the vain toys were presented, they were at once received without examination and selection as genuine. In this way, men made no difficulty in hugging any ass' or dog's bones which any trifler chose to bring forward as the bones of martyrs. The same thing, as we will afterwards show, happened in other cases, and, I doubt not, by just punishment from God. For when the world, inflamed, as it were, with a kind of rage, longed after relics, that they might pervert them to superstition, it might have been anticipated that God would permit lie to follow upon lie. For in this way is He wont to avenge insult offered to his name, when the glory due only to Himself is transferred to others. Wherefore, the true explanation of the fact, that so many spurious relics exist, is just that when men were delighting in lies, God permitted them to fall into a double error.

The duty of Christians was, to leave the bodies of saints in their tombs in obedience to the universal sentence by which it is declared, that man is dust, and to dust will return; not to raise them up in sumptuousness and splendour, as if they were fabricating a premature resurrection. This duty, however, was not at all understood; but, on the contrary, against the decree of God, the bodies of the faithful were dug up and exalted in splendour, when they ought to have rested in the grave as in a bed till the last day. They were sought after and confided in, and even worshipped; in short, every mark of reverence was paid to them. And what was the result? The devil perceiving the infatuation, thought it not enough to deceive men in one way, but added also the imposture of inscribing the names of relics on things

Digitized by Google

altogether profane; while God, in just vengeance, deprived them of all thought and discernment, so that, without any investigation, whether the thing was white or black, they received indiscriminately whatever was offered to them.

At present, indeed, it is not my design to show what abomination there is in abusing the relics both of Christ and the Saints, in the way in which it has hitherto been done, and is common even in the present day in the greater part of Christendom, for the subject would require a volume to itself. But as it is clear that a great majority of the relics which are exhibited are spurious, being brought forward by certain deceivers, who have impudently imposed on the meanest of the people, it has occurred to me to mention some things which may furnish men of sense with an occasion of thought and reflection. For often, when preoccupied by error or opinion, we approve inconsiderately, without taking time to examine and form a right judgment, and in this way our thoughtlessness deceives us. But, when put on our guard, we begin to attend, our wonder is, how we could have been so giddy and easy in believing what had no appearance of truth. This is exactly what has happened in the present case. For men not being at all on their guard, but being preoccupied by a false opinion, when it is said, "there is the body of such a saint, there are his shoes, there his sandals," easily persuade themselves that it is so. But when I shall have called attention to frauds which cannot be now denied, every man, of even the least prudence, will open his eyes, and employ his mind in considering what had never occurred to himself.

But in this short treatise, I am not able to accomplish what I particularly desire, for it would be necessary to obtain catalogues from all quarters, that it might be known what relics are said to exist in every separate place, so that they might be compared with each other. In this way it would be made manifest that every Apostle has more than four bodies, and every Saint two or three. The same thing would appear in other instances; in short, when the whole heap was collected, there is no man who would not

Digitized by Google

be amazed at seeing how ridiculously the whole world had been blinded. The way in which I considered the matter with myself was this:—Since there is no catholic church so small as not to have an infinity of bones and such like frivolities, what would it be if we were to pile up the whole multitude contained in three or four thousand dioceses, in twenty or thirty thousand abbacies, forty thousand monasteries, nay more, in the whole multitude of parishes and chapels? Still the best thing would be to see the things, and not merely to give their names, for, indeed, they are not all known by name. It was said, that in this city there was an arm of St Anthony. While enclosed in its case, all kissed and worshipped it, but when brought forward into view, it proved to be a nameless part of a stag. On a certain great altar lay part of the brain of St Peter. So long as it was in its case no man doubted,—for it would have been blasphemy not to credit the name,—but when the nest was shaken up, and observed more accurately, it turned out to be a pumice-stone. I might give many similar examples, but these will suffice to show what rubbish would be brought to light, if all the relics throughout Europe were carefully visited, provided it were done with prudence and discrimination. For some persons, when certain relics are exhibited, close their eyes from superstition, and so seeing, see not. I mean, they dare not examine in earnest, so as carefully to ascertain what they are. Thus many who give out that they have seen the entire body of Claud, or some other saint, never ventured to raise their eyes so as to see what it was. But any one who had the liberty of a private inspection, and would dare to use it, would speak very differently. The same may be said of the head of the Magdalene which is shown at Marseilles with a bit of pitch or wax attached to the eye. It is treasured up like some god that has dropt from heaven, but were it examined, the cheat would easily be detected.

It were to be wished, then, that we had certain information concerning all the foolish articles which, in different quarters, are regarded as relics, or, at least, that we had a re-

Digitized by Google

gular catalogue of them, that it might appear how many are spurious. But since that cannot be, I could wish at least to obtain an inventory from ten or twelve cities, such as Paris, Tholouse, Rheims, Poictiers. For in them alone strange hives as of bees, or at least very curious manufactures, would be seen. Often do I earnestly wish I could obtain such an inventory. But as this would be too difficult for me to accomplish, I at last thought it would be better just to give this brief admonition, by which I might stir up the drowsy, to think what the whole must be when so much imposition is detected in a few. My meaning is; if in the relic chests, which I shall name, though forming not a thousandth part of the whole which are shown, so much imposition appears, what judgment should be formed of the residue? Moreover, if it appears that those which are deemed most genuine are spurious, what should be thought of the doubtful? Would that Christian princes would give some little attention to this. It is part of their office not to allow their miserable subjects to be not only led astray by false doctrines, but also openly imposed upon, in being persuaded, according to the bye-word, that "bladders are lanterns;" for they will have to account to God for their dissimulation in conniving at these things while they see them, and they will be made to feel that it was, indeed, a most heinous offence to allow God to be held in derision, when they could have prevented it. However, I hope that this little book will be of use to all, and suggest to each, in his own place, the propriety of considering, as the title of this treatise intimates, viz., that if all the relics of Christendom were described, it would be manifest that all men have hitherto been blind, that great darkness has brooded over the whole globe, and the greatest stupidity been universally displayed.

Let us begin then with Christ. As his natural body could not be possessed, (though some have found an easy way of fabricating miraculous bodies for him, in whatever numbers, and with whatever frequency they please,) instead of it they have collected six hundred frivolities to compen-

Digitized by Google

sate for its absence. They have not even allowed the body of Christ to escape entirely, but have managed to retain a portion. For, besides teeth and hair, the monks of Charrox give out that they have the prepuce, that is, the pellicle cut off in his circumcision. And how, pray, did this pellicle come to them? The Evangelist Luke relates that the Lord was circumcised, but it is nowhere said that the skin was preserved for relics. All ancient histories are silent respecting it, and for the space of five hundred years this subject was not once broached in the Christian Church. Where was it lying hid all the time, and how did it so suddenly burst into notice? Moreover, how came it to travel so far as Charrox? But as a proof of its genuineness, they say that some drops of blood fell from it. They, indeed, say this, but they should prove it. It is plainly a mere absurdity. But were we to grant that this pellicle was preserved, and so might be there or elsewhere, what shall we say of the prepuce which is shown at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis? As it is certain there was only one, it cannot possibly be both at Rome and Charrox. Thus the falsehood becomes manifest.

Next comes the blood, about which there have been great disputes. For very many have maintained, that no blood of Christ exists, except what is miraculous. And yet his natural blood is exhibited in more than a hundred places; in some of them, as at Rochelle in Aunis, in a few drops which Nicodemus is said to have received in his handkerchief; in others, in full phials, as at Mantua. At Billom in Auvergne, it is shown in a crystal vase, in the form of a liquid, while, at a village in the same neighbourhood, and in other places, it is coagulated. Elsewhere, as in the church of Eustathius at Rome, it is poured from full goblets. Nor was it enough to have pure blood; they must needs also have it mingled with water, as it flowed from our Saviour's side when it was pierced on the cross. This ware is found at Rome in the church of Joannes Lateranensis. I leave every man to judge what certainty can be had on such a subject, and whether it be not a manifest falsehood to say that the

Digitized by Google

blood of Christ has been found seven or eight hundred years after his death, and in such quantities as to be diffused over the whole world, and this without any mention of it whatever in the ancient Church.

Next come certain things which were in contact with the body of our Lord, or, at least, things which could be collected, and in the absence of his body be converted into relics, so as to keep it in remembrance. First, There is shown at Rome, in the church of the elder Mary, the manger in which he was laid at his birth, and in the church of St Paul, the linen in which he was swaddled, although some portion of it is said to be in the church of St Salvator in Spain. There also is shown his cradle, together with the shirt which his mother, Mary, put upon him. Likewise at Rome, in the church of St James, is the altar on which he was placed on his being presented in the temple—as if various altars had then existed, as under the Papacy, where they are erected at pleasure. In this matter, the lie appears without disguise.

These are the pretended relics which belong to the period of our Saviour's childhood. It cannot be necessary gravely to discuss the question, how these articles were discovered, so long after our Saviour's death. No man is dull enough not to see that the whole affair is sheer madness. The Evangelical History says not a word of these things, nor were they ever heard of in the days of the apostles. About fifty years after the death of Christ, Jerusalem was pillaged and overthrown. Since then, numerous ancient Doctors have written and made mention of the things which existed in their day—in particular, of the cross and nails which Helena found. But of these paltry trifles there is not a word. Nay, even in the time of Gregory, as is evident from his writings, not one of them existed at Rome. After his death, Rome was repeatedly taken, pillaged, and almost utterly destroyed. If these considerations are duly weighed, what else can be said but that all these relics were devised for the purpose of imposing on ignorant people? And, indeed, the favourers of a false religion, both priests and

Digitized by Google

monks, confess this, giving them the name of "pious frauds," as if by their means the people were incited to piety.

A second class of relics belongs to the intervening period between our Saviour's childhood and his death. Among them is the pillar on which Christ leaned when disputing in the temple, together with eleven similar pillars belonging to the Temple of Solomon. But who revealed to them that Christ when disputing leaned on a pillar? The Evangelist, in giving an account of the disputation, does not even allude to it. Nor is it likely that the preachers' place was granted to him, when, as is manifest, he possessed no reputation or authority. Besides, even if he did lean on a pillar, how, I ask, do they know that this was the one? Again, where did they find the twelve pillars which they say belonged to Solomon's Temple?

Then they have the waterpots in which our Saviour turned the water into wine, when he was present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee. I would fain know who was their custodier all the time, and afterwards made presents of them. For it is always to be observed, that they did not make their appearance till eight hundred or a thousand years after the miracle was performed. I am not acquainted with all the places where these are shown. I know, however, that they have them at Ravenna, Pisa, Clugny, Angers, and in the church of St Salvator in Spain. But not to dwell on this, it is easy to prove the imposture by merely taking a look at them. For some have only the capacity of a gallon measure, a little more or less, while others could contain eight firkins. Let these be reconciled with each other if it be possible, and then I will let them have their waterpots without dispute. But not contented with the pots, they have thought proper to have the liquor also. For at Orleans they give out that they are in possession of some of the wine; they say it belonged to the Architriclinus, (the master of the feast.) The people think this Architriclinus is the bridegroom's name, and they are still kept in their ignorance. Once a-year they give the smallest possible tasting on the tip of the tongue to those

Digitized by Google

who are pleased to bring some offering, and they are told that they are quaffing the wine which the Lord made at the feast. Nor is the quantity ever diminished; only the cup requires now and then to be filled up. I am not aware of the size of his shoes which are said to exist at Rome in the place which they call the Holy of Holies, and whether he used them when he was a boy, or after manhood; but it is all alike. For the observations I have already made are sufficient to show how impudent it is at this time of day to pass off, as belonging to Christ, shoes of which the Apostles had never heard.

Let us now come to relics of the last Supper, which Christ celebrated with the Apostles. The table is at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, some of the bread in that of St Salvator in Spain, while the knife with which the Paschal Lamb was cut up is at Treves. Be it observed, Christ celebrated the Supper in a hired room, and, of course, on quitting it, left the table behind. Nor do we read that it was carried off by the Apostles. Some years after, as we have said, Jerusalem was destroyed. What semblance of probability is there, that that table was found out seven or eight hundred years after? Besides, tables were at that time quite different in shape from those now in use. For at meals, the custom was not to sit, but to recline; this is clearly shown in the gospel. There is here, therefore, a manifest falsehood. What more? At the church of Mary Insulane, near Lyons, is shown the cup which contained the Sacrament of his blood which he gave to the Apostles to drink. It is also to be seen in the Vivarais in a certain monastery of Augustins. Which are we to believe? But the case is still worse with the dish in which the Paschal Lamb was placed. For it is at Rome, and at Genoa, and at Arles. Perhaps the custom of that time was different from ours. For as in the present day, a variety of meats are put into one dish; so there must then have been various dishes for one meat, if credit is to be given to these holy relics. Can falsehood be more clearly proved? The same thing

Digitized by Google

occurs in the case of the linen towel with which our Saviour wiped the feet of the Apostles, after he had washed them. There is one at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, and another at Acqs in Germany, in the church of Cornelius, with the mark of Judas' foot upon it; one or other of these must be spurious. What, then, shall our judgment be? Let us leave them to debate the matter among themselves, until one shall have made out something like a case. Meanwhile, let us hold it a mere imposition to attempt to persuade men that a towel, which our Saviour left in the house in which he celebrated the Supper, took its flight to Italy or Germany, five or six hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem. I have omitted to mention the bread on which the five thousand were miraculously fed in the wilderness. A piece of it is shown at Rome, in the church of Maria Nova, and a smaller piece in that of St Salvator in Spain. Scripture relates, that a portion of the manna was reserved as a memorial of the great miracle by which God fed the Israelites in the desert. But though there are five relics of the loaves, the Evangelist does not relate that any of them was preserved for such a purpose; nor is the thing mentioned by any ancient history, or by any of the ancient Doctors of the Church. It is easy, therefore, to conclude, that that which is now shown is of a more recent batch. We must come to the same conclusion, concerning the branch which is in the church of St Salvator in Spain. They say it is the one which Christ carried when he entered Jerusalem, on the feast of the Passover, or, as they call it, Floridos. But it is no where said in the gospel that Christ carried a branch; the whole, therefore, is manifest fiction. The same rank must be assigned to other relics which are exhibited at the same place, namely, the earth on which our Saviour's feet rested when he raised Lazarus. Who, pray, marked the place so carefully, as to be able, after the destruction of Jerusalem, by which every thing in Judea was changed, accurately to point out the very spot?

Digitized by Google

We come now to the principal relics of our Lord, viz., those connected with his sufferings and death. And, first, let us consider the case of the cross on which he was suspended. I know it is regarded as a certain fact, that Helena, the mother of the Emperor Constantine, discovered it. And I am not ignorant of what ancient Doctors have written, to prove that it undoubtedly was the cross on which our Saviour was crucified. Let all those have their due credit, though it was vain curiosity, or ill-judged religious zeal, that caused Helena to make the search for it. But assuming that her exertions to find out the cross are worthy of all praise, and that our Lord himself, after it was found, miraculously declared that it was truly his cross, let us see how the matter is to be viewed with reference to our own times. The cross which Helena found is said to be still at Jerusalem. And no one calls this in question, though it is plainly inconsistent with ecclesiastical history, which relates that Helena sent part of it to the emperor her son, by whom it was placed on a pillar of porphyry at Constantinople; and that she inclosed the remainder in a silver chest, which she gave to the Bishop of Jerusalem for preservation. Therefore, we must either accuse the history of falsehood, or the things told of the true cross in the present day are utterly vain and frivolous.

Again, let us consider how many fragments of it are scattered up and down over the whole globe. A mere enumeration of those of which I have a catalogue would certainly fill a goodly volume. There is no town, however small, which has not some morsel of it, and this not only in the principal cathedral church of the district, but also in parish churches. There is no abbey so poor as not to have a specimen. In some places, larger fragments exist, as at Paris, in the Holy Chapel, at Poictiers, and at Rome, where a crucifix of tolerable size is said to have been entirely made out of it. In fine, if all the pieces which could be found were collected into a heap, they would form a good ship-load, though the gospel testi-

Digitized by Google

fies, that a single individual was able to carry it. What effrontery, then, thus to fill the whole world with fragments, which it would take more than three hundred men to carry? But they have fallen upon an explanation, and it is, that how much soever may be cut from it, it never grows less. But this device is too foolish and absurd for the superstitious themselves not easily to see through it. I leave it to all men to consider what certainty can be had as to the genuineness of all the pieces of wood which are worshipped in all the different places as the true cross. Whence certain fragments were brought, and by what way and means, I omit to say; some affirming that they were brought to them by angels, others that they dropt from heaven. Those of Poictiers say, that the piece which they have was stolen by a maid-servant of Helena, and carried off, and that she having afterwards fled, brought it, in the course of her wanderings, into that district. They also add to the story that she was lame. Such are the illustrious grounds on which they stimulate the wretched populace to idolatry. And not contented with imposing on the rude and ignorant, by displaying a piece of common wood as the wood of the cross, they have declared it every way worthy of adoration. The doctrine is altogether devilish, and Ambrose expressly condemns it as heathen superstition.

Next after the cross comes the title which Pilate ordered to be affixed to it, and on which he wrote, "JESUS OF NAZARETH, KING OF THE JEWS." But we must know the time, place, and manner, of its being found. It will be said that Socrates, the Ecclesiastical Historian, makes mention of it. This I admit. But he says nothing as to what became of it, and hence his testimony is of no great weight. Besides, that inscription having been written hastily, and on the spur of the moment, after our Saviour had been actually crucified, it is most irrational to suppose that it was a picture painted skilfully as for display. Were only one exhibited, it might deservedly be deemed false and fictitious, but when the people of Tholouse say that

Digitized by Google

they have it, and those of Rome contradict them, and show it in the church of Santa Croce, they convict each other of falsehood. Let them, therefore, debate the matter among themselves as long as they please; in the end, if all things are duly examined, both will be proved false.

There is a still greater controversy as to the nails. I will mention those of which I have heard, and from them the merest child will judge how grossly the devil had deluded mankind, after having deprived them of all sense and reason, and so made them incapable of exercising any discernment in the matter. If ancient writers, and especially Theodoret, the historian of the ancient Church, say true, Helena ordered one to be fixed in her son's helmet, and the other two to be fitted to his horse's bridle. Yet Ambrose does not express an unqualified assent. For he says, that one was fixed in the crown of Constantine, that his horse-bit was made of the second, and that Helena kept the third to herself. We thus see, that twelve hundred years ago there was a controversy as to what became of the nails. What certainty, then, can we now have? The Milanese boast of having the one which was fitted to the horse's bridle, while the inhabitants of Carpentras interpose, and claim it for themselves. But Ambrose does not say at all that it was fitted to the bit, but that it was made into a bit, an account which cannot by any possibility agree with what is affirmed by the inhabitants of Milan and of Carpentras. There are also two nails at Rome, one in the church of St Helena, and another in that of Santa Croce. Then there is one at Sienna, another at Venice, two in Germany, viz. at Cologne, in the church of the Three Maries, and at Treves. In France, there is one in the Holy Chapel, another in the possession of the Carmelites, another at the church of St Denis, in the Isle of France, another at Bourges, another in the Abbey of Ciseaux, and another at Draguignan. Here we have them to the number of fourteen. Moreover, each place seems confident of the sufficiency of the proof

Digitized by Google

in its favour. One thing certainly I will concede, that all the claims are equally good, and hence nothing is simpler than to pass the same sentence upon all, namely, to account them all, in spite of their boasting, to be spurious. There is no other way of unravelling the matter.

The next thing in order is the soldier's spear. This ought to be one only, but perhaps, from having felt the fire of some alchymist, it has increased and multiplied. For four have come to light, besides those which exist in different places, of which I have not the names. There is one at Rome, another in the Holy Chapel at Paris, a third at Saintonge in the monastery of Ciseaux, a fourth at Selve, near Bourdeaux. Which of these, then, is to be selected as the true one? The easier course will be to turn them all adrift, and leave them as they are. But granting that there is one, I would fain know where it was found. As no ancient histories, or other writings, mention it, it must be of modern manufacture.

In regard to the crown of thorns, it would seem that its twigs had been planted that they might grow again. Otherwise I know not how it could have attained to such a size. First, a third part of it is at Paris, in the Holy Chapel, and then at Rome there are three thorns in Santa Croce, and some portion also in St Eustathius. At Sienna, I know not how many thorns, at Vincennes one, at Bourges five, at Besançon, in the church of St John, three, and as many at Königsberg. At the church of St Salvator, in Spain, are several, but how many I know not; at Compostella, in the church of St Jago, two; in Vivarais, three; also at Toulouse, Mascon, Charrox in Poictou, St Clair, Sanflor, San Maximin in Provence, in the monastery of Selles, and also in the church of St Martin at Noyon, each place having a single thorn. But if diligent search were made, the number might be increased fourfold. It is most evident that there must here be falsehood and imposition. How will the truth be ascertained? It ought, moreover, to be observed, that in the ancient Church it was never

Digitized by Google

known what had become of that crown. Hence it is easy to conclude, that the first twig of that now shown grew many years after our Saviour's death.

Next comes the purple robe in which Pilate clothed Christ in derision, because he had called himself a king. It was a costly robe not to be carelessly cast away. Nor is it to be supposed, that, after the mockery of Christ was over, Pilate or his servants did cast it away. I should like to know who the merchant was that purchased it from Pilate to preserve it for relics. To give some colour to their fiction, they show some drops of blood upon it, as if, forsooth, the villains who put it on the shoulders of Christ in mockery had afterwards chosen to destroy it. I know not whether any thing under the same name is found elsewhere. The coat, woven from the top to the bottom, and without seam, as it seemed better adapted to stimulate the piety of the unlearned, has produced a considerable number of others. For one is exhibited at Argenteuil, a village in the suburbs of Paris, and another at Treves. But if the Bull which is in the church of St Salvator in Spain says true, Christians have, from inconsiderate zeal, sinned more heinously than those wicked soldiers who did not dare to divide it. Christians have not feared to tear it in pieces, for purposes of adoration. But what will the Turk say, who, while he derides the madness, declares that it is with him? It is unnecessary, however, to go to law with the Turks about it, as they will have enough to do in settling the quarrel among themselves. Meanwhile, we have a good excuse for not giving credit to any of them; for we must not favour either party before hearing the cause. This were a violation of equity. Nay, if they wish to be believed, they must first reconcile themselves with the Evangelists. The matter stands thus—The garment for which lots were cast was the tunic, which the Greeks call χιτων. I would have men carefully consider the form of the one which is at Strasburgh or at Treves. They will find that the one at Strasburgh resembles the robe used at mass, and to which they give the name of *chasuble*. And, therefore, though they

Digitized by Google

were to put out men's eyes, the imposture might still be detected, being such as may be felt by the hand.

To conclude this article, I wish to propose a simple question. Scripture declares that the soldiers parted our Saviour's vesture among them; and it is most certain that they did so for their own private advantage. Will they now then tell me what Christian it was who bought of the soldiers the tunic and other vestments, which are exhibited, for instance, at Rome, in the church of St Eustathius, and in other places? How came the Evangelists to forget the circumstance? for it was absurd to tell us that the soldiers parted the vesture among them, without also telling who it was that redeemed it out of the hands of the soldiers, in order that it might be preserved for relics. Moreover, how came the ancient writers to be so unkind as never to say one word on the subject? In solving these questions, they had better choose a day when men are devoid of sense, intelligence, and judgment. But they have not stopped here. In addition to the robe, they have thought proper also to have the dice employed in casting the lots. One of these is at Treves, another at St Salvator's in Spain. In this they have characteristically displayed their childishness. The lots to which the Evangelists refer were those which were usually taken out of a hat or urn, as in the present day when a king is elected by ballot, or in the common game called Biancha. In short, everybody knows how lots are cast when lands or heritages are divided. But those asses have imagined that the lot was like our one for playing at dice, though that thing was not then in existence, at least in the shape in which we now have it. For, in place of the dots which are upon our dice, they had certain figures, such as Venus, or a dog, which they designated by their proper names. Let them now go and kiss their relics, on the testimony of men, thus stupid, and thus absurd in their lies.

We must now consider the napkin, as to which they have still more openly betrayed their impudence and stupidity. For, besides the napkin of Veronica, which is ex-

Digitized by Google

hibited at St Peter's, and the robe which the Virgin Mary is said to have wrapped round our Saviour, and which is shown in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, and also in the Augustin monastery at Carcassone, they have also the napkin in which our Saviour's head was wrapped in the sepulchre. This is exhibited at the same place. There are, at least, six cities more which boast of having this very napkin, as the one at Nice, which was brought from Cambray, also those at Acqs in Germany, at Maestricht, at Besançon, and also at Vindon in Limoges, also in a certain town in Lorraine, on the borders of Alsace; besides portions of it which are scattered up and down in different places, as at St Salvator's in Spain, and in a monastery of Augustins in the Vivarais. I say nothing of that complete napkin, which exists in a certain nunnery at Rome, as the Pope has expressly prohibited the exhibition of it. Must not men, I ask, have been exceedingly infatuated, to travel so far, at great expense, and with greater trouble, to see a bit of cloth, as to which not the least certainty could be had, or rather as to which they must, of necessity, have had their doubts? For whosoever believes that this napkin exists in one particular place, brings a charge of falsehood against all the others which boast that they possess it. For instance, he who believes that the piece of cloth which was at Cambray is the genuine napkin, condemns those of Besançon, of Acqs, of Vindon, of Maestricht, and of Rome, as guilty of falsehood and of wickedness, inasmuch as they stimulate the people to idolatry, and impose upon them, by making them believe that a bit of common cloth is the linen which wrapped our Saviour's body in the tomb.

Let us now attend to the testimony which the Gospel gives on the subject; for it were little that they merely convicted each other of falsehood, if the Holy Spirit did not oppose them, and openly condemn all of them to a man. First, it is very strange that the Evangelists make no mention of Veronica, who is said to have wiped our Saviour's face with a napkin, though they speak of all the

Digitized by Google

women who accompanied our Saviour to the cross. The circumstance would have been remarkable, and well worthy of a place in their narrative, had our Saviour's face been miraculously imprinted on a napkin. On the other hand, it does not seem a matter of much importance that some women accompanied our Saviour to the cross, if nothing miraculous, in regard to them, was performed. How comes it that the Evangelists relate things of little or of no great importance, and are silent as to the most important of all? For, had such a miracle been performed as is commonly pretended, the Holy Spirit is chargeable either with forgetfulness or thoughtlessness, in having failed to select the matters which it was of most importance to relate. So much for their Veronica, as to whom all men may see how manifestly false every thing is which they would fain have generally believed.

In regard to the linen clothes in which our Saviour's body was wrapped, I would, in like manner, ask how it comes, that while the Evangelists carefully enumerate the miracles which took place at the death of Christ, and omit nothing which is pertinent to the history, this wondrous miracle so completely escaped them, that they say not a word about the impression of our Lord's body which was stamped on his grave-clothes? The circumstance surely was as worthy of being mentioned as many others. John declares that Peter went into the sepulchre, and saw the linen clothes lying in a place by themselves, but he makes no mention of the miraculous impression. It cannot be supposed that he would have suppressed so wondrous a miracle, had it really been performed. But another doubt occurs. It is nowhere said by the Evangelists that the linen clothes were carried away out of the sepulchre by the disciples or the holy women. Though they do not speak in express terms, they rather insinuate that they left them there. Then the sepulchre was guarded by the soldiers, and of course the linen clothes remained in their power. Is it likely that they gave them to some pious individual for the purpose of being converted into relics; especially when it is

Digitized by Google

considered that the Pharisees had bribed them to perjure themselves by declaring that the disciples had secretly stolen away the body? It is almost unnecessary to add, that the imposture may be completely detected merely by inspecting the impression which is exhibited. It is perfectly clear that it was painted by a human hand. I cannot cease wondering how those who framed the imposture were so dull of understanding as not to use more craft in the doing of it; and, still more, how others were so silly as to allow themselves to be blindfolded, and thereby unfitted to see through a matter so very transparent. Nay, it appears that they have painters at hand. For one napkin happening to be burned, another was forthwith produced. No doubt, it was affirmed to be the same that was shown before, but the picture was so fresh that there would have been no room for the falsehood, had not eyes been altogether wanting to perceive it.

To conclude in one word, their impudence will be proved by an argument which cannot be gainsayed. In all the places where they pretend to have the grave-clothes, they show a large piece of linen by which the whole body, including the head, was covered, and, accordingly, the figure exhibited is that of an entire body. But the Evangelist John relates that Christ was buried, "as is the manner of the Jews to bury." What that manner was may be learned, not only from the Jews, by whom it is still observed, but also from their books, which explain what the ancient practice was. It was this: The body was wrapped up by itself as far as the shoulders, and then the head by itself was bound round with a napkin, tied by the four corners, into a knot. And this is expressed by the Evangelist, when he says that Peter saw the linen clothes in which the body had been wrapped lying in one place, and the napkin which had been wrapped about the head lying in another. The term napkin may mean either a handkerchief employed to wipe the face, or it may mean a shawl, but never means a large piece of linen in which the whole body may be wrapped. I have, however, used the term in the sense which they improperly give to it. On the whole, either the Evangelist John must have given

Digitized by Google

a false account, or every one of them must be convicted of falsehood, thus making it manifest that they have too impudently imposed on the unlearned.

I would never come to an end were I to go, one by one, over all the absurd articles which they have drawn into the service. At Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, is shown the reed which was put into our Saviour's hand as a sceptre, when he was mocked and scourged at Pilate's judgment-seat. At the same place, in the church of Santa Croce, is shown the spunge which was offered to our Saviour containing vinegar mixed with gall. How, I ask, were those things recovered? They were in the hands of the wicked. Did they give them to the Apostles, that they might preserve them for relics? Or did they, themselves, lock them up that they might preserve them for some future period? What blasphemy, to abuse the name of Christ by employing it as a cloak for such drivelling fables! The same account must be given of the money which Judas received to betray his Master. The Evangelist relates that it was returned by himself in the synagogue of the Pharisees, and was afterwards employed in the purchase of a field to bury strangers in. Who got back this money out of the hands of the seller of the field? It would be too ridiculous to say it was the disciples. Some more plausible account must be given. If they answer that it took place a long time after, the thing will be still less plausible, since in that case the pieces of silver must have passed through many hands, and been mingled with other pieces. They will, therefore, require to show that the owner of the field actually sold it with the intention of getting possession of these pieces of money, that he might be able to use them as relics, or to sell them over again to the faithful. Of this, however, there is no mention whatever in the ancient Church.

There is a similar fiction with regard to the steps of Pilate's judgment-seat. These exist at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, together with the holes into which they say that drops of blood fell from our Saviour's body. In like manner, in the church of Praxed is shown the pillar

Digitized by Google

to which he was bound when he was scourged, and three other pillars in the church of Santa Croce, round which he was led when taken away to die. I know not how they came to dream of all these pillars. This much, at least, is certain, that they are the offspring of their own brain; for we read not a word of them in the whole Gospel history. We read, no doubt, that Christ was scourged; but that he was bound to a pillar is their own invention. It must be obvious, therefore, that these impostors have done nothing else than attempt to rear up a huge pile of lies. In doing this, they have carried their license to such a length that they have not hesitated to make a relic of the tail of the ass on which our Saviour rode, and which is exhibited at Genoa. But it is not so much their impudence that astonishes us as the infatuation and stupidity of men, in religiously embracing such absurdities.

Here, perhaps, some one will allege it to be improbable that the relics which I have now named would be exhibited with so much pomp if they were not able to show whence they came, and by whose hands they were received. I answer, in one word, that nothing like probability is employed to cloak these transparent lies. For how much soever they may shelter themselves under the name of Constantine, or King Louis, or some of the Popes, all this avails them not when they have to prove that fourteen nails were used in fixing our Saviour to the cross, that a whole hedge was plaited in making his crown of thorns, that the spear's point produced three other points, that his robe was so multiplied as to be converted into three, or that it changed its form so as to be metamorphosed into a robe for mass, to which it had not the least resemblance, or that one napkin produced as many other napkins as a hen does chickens, or that our Saviour was buried after a different fashion from that which the Evangelists relate. Were I to take a lump of lead, and pointing to it, to say, "This gold was given me by such a prince," I would deservedly be thought mad. At all events, my assertion would make no change upon the colour or the nature of the lead, so as to convert it into gold. In the

Digitized by Google

same way, when it is said, "See what Godfrey of Boulogne sent into these quarters after he had subdued Judea," though the lie is obviously repugnant to reason, will we allow ourselves to take the account without using our eyes to see what lies plain before them?

For to convince all men how little credit is due to the proofs which they adduce in support of their relics, it is to be observed, that the chief and most authentic of those which are seen at Rome are said to have been brought thither by Titus and Vespasian. This fiction is not a whit more ingenious than if it were said that the Grand Turk went to Jerusalem in order that he might bring the cross of Christ to Constantinople. Vespasian, before he became Emperor, subdued and laid waste a part of Judea. Afterwards, when he had obtained the empire, his son Titus, whom he had left in command, took Jerusalem. Now, both of them were heathens, and cared no more for Christ than if he had never been born. In the same way, we may judge whether, in alleging that Godfrey of Boulogne, or King Louis, brought these relics, they have not lied with equal effrontery as when they said it was Vespasian. Besides, let it be considered what kind of judgment was displayed by that king to whom they give the name of St Louis, and by others like him. They had, no doubt, a semblance of religion, and a zeal, such as it was, for the propagation of the Christian name. But if the droppings of goats had been shown them, and they been told at the same time that they were the Virgin Mary's beads, they would have worshipped them at once, without ever debating the matter, and would have sent ships to transport them to any place where they were to be set up and honoured. It cannot be denied they wasted both their resources and their bodily strength, and also spent a goodly part of their revenues in bringing back a heap of indescribable trifles and toys, by which the minds of men were so fascinated as to regard them as most valuable jewels. To give a clearer illustration of the fact, I may observe, that throughout the whole of Greece, Asia Minor, and Mauritania, and the whole of those countries which go under the

Digitized by Google

name of the Indies, all the antique relics which our idolators imagine that they possess here are there exhibited with the greatest confidence. How are we to decide between these two parties? Our people say that the relics were brought away from those places. The Christians who are living there affirm that they still possess them, and deride our foolish boasting. How can the dispute be decided without investigation—investigation, however, which cannot, and never will, be made? The only remedy is to despise both, and leave the matter as it is, *in statu quo*.

The last class of relics belonging to Christ are those which relate to events subsequent to his resurrection; *e. g.* the piece of broiled fish which Peter offered to him when he appeared on the sea-shore. It must have been wondrously well salted if it has kept for such a long series of ages! But, jesting apart, is it supposable that the apostles made relics of what they had actually prepared for dinner? Whoever does not perceive that the whole matter is an open mockery of God, I must leave as unworthy of being farther addressed on the subject. Then we have the miraculous blood which has flowed from many of the hosts at mass; as at Paris, in the church of John Arenarius, and also in that of John the Angel; as also at Dijon, and many other places. And, in order to enlarge the heap, they have added the impious knife with which the host was stabbed at Paris by a certain Jew. This knife the Parisians regard with greater veneration than the host itself. When Doctor à Quercus, who held the cure of St John Arenarius, found that the donations made to this host stood in his way, (his gains being diminished in proportion to what the knife received,) he indignantly exclaimed, that they were worse than the Jews, inasmuch as they were worshipping a knife which had been the instrument of violating the sacred body of Christ. I have adduced this instance, because the exclamation would equally apply to the spear, the nails, and the crown of thorns; all who adore them being, in the opinion of Master à Quercus, more impious than the Jews by whom Christ was crucified.

Digitized by Google

In like manner are shown the prints of his feet in a place where he is said to have appeared to several individuals after his ascension, as at Rome, in the church of St Lawrence, at the spot where he is said to have appeared to Peter, and foretold him that he was to suffer at Rome. Another of these foot-marks is to be seen at Poictiers, in the church of Arabegend, another at Soissons, and another at Arles. I deny not that Christ could have left the mark of his foot upon a stone. I only deny the allegation of his having actually done so. In the absence of all proper proof, I maintain that the whole ought to be regarded as a mere fable. But the most admirable specimen of this description of relics is the impression of his hips, which is seen at Rheims, on a stone behind the altar, and is said to have been left at the time when our Saviour turned mason, in order that he might build the vestibule of that church. The blasphemy is so execrable, that I am almost ashamed to mention it.

To proceed, let us now attend to what is said of images, I mean not those which are usually made by painters, sculptors, and artists—(the number of these is infinite;) —but of those which possess some special claim to respect, and are regarded as singular and precious, as being of the nature of relics. Of these there are two kinds; for some have been miraculously formed, as that which is shown at Rome, in the portico of the church of St Mary. There is another also in the church of Joannes Lateranensis; and another, in which there is a picture of our Lord, said to have been taken at the time when he was twelve years old. There is also another at Lucca, which they say was painted by angels, and is called "The Holy Countenance." These follies are so absurd, that I would lose my pains, and feel I was absurdly wasting my time, were I to dwell upon them. It is sufficient, therefore, merely to have noticed them in passing; for everybody knows that painting is not at all an office which belongs to angels, and that the means by which our Lord wished to make himself known, and imprinted on our memory, was very different from lifeless images. Eusebius

Digitized by Google

relates, in his Ecclesiastical History, that our Saviour sent his picture, painted to the life, to King Abgarus; and this is somewhat more certain than a fiction taken from the Chronicles of Milan. But though the fact were so, how came they to obtain it from King Abgarus? It is said to be at Rome; but Eusebius says not that it was in existence up to his day. He only speaks by hearsay, as of a thing which had occurred long before. Is it to be believed, that it was brought to light six or seven hundred years after; and, quitting Persia, travelled as far as Rome?

Pictures of the cross have been fabricated in the same way as those of our Saviour's person. It is given out at Brescia, that they have the very cross that appeared to Constantine. I will not dispute the matter with them; I only send them to the Cortonians, who firmly maintain that they possess it. Let them litigate the matter between themselves, and then let the one who gains his plea come forward, and we will give him his answer. Indeed, it is not difficult to find an answer that will convict them all of folly. For when some writers say that a cross appeared to Constantine, they mean not a material cross, but the figure of a cross which was exhibited to him by a visible representation in the sky. Therefore, although the fact were true, it is clear that they have fallen into a very stupid blunder, and reared up their imposture without giving it the shadow of a foundation.

But there is a second species of images which are regarded as relics, in consequence of certain services which they have performed. To this class of images belong crucifixes, on which the beard grows; for instance, one at Burgos in Spain, another in the church of St Salvator, and another in that of Aurengia. Were I to dwell upon this for the purpose of demonstrating what folly, or rather brutish stupidity, it is to believe such a thing, I should make myself ridiculous. The whole matter is so absurd in itself, that it cannot be at all necessary to spend time in refuting it, and yet the wretched populace are so dull, that the great majority of them think it just as certain as the

Digitized by Google

gospel. With these, also, I class those crucifixes which have spoken, and of which there is a great multitude. But let us content ourselves with one, by way of example, viz., the one which is at St Denis in France. It spoke, they say, when it testified that the Church was dedicated. Leaving others to consider how far the importance of the matter called for such utterance, I only ask how an image of the cross could have been in the Church at that time, when, according to the custom used at dedications, all the images are removed from the Church? How did it manage to steal away and conceal itself, so as not to be removed with the rest? We see how easy a matter they must suppose it is to deceive the world, since they care not how much they contradict themselves, but deem it enough to belch forth their lies with open mouth, giving themselves no concern about any objections that might be urged. Lastly, we have got tears also; one, for instance, at Vindon, another at Treves, in the church of St Maximin, another at Orleans, in the church of Peter Puellare, besides many which are unknown to me. Some of these are said to be natural tears, as the one at St Maximin; for, according to their chronicle, our Lord let it fall when he was washing the disciples' feet. Others are miraculous, as if it were to be believed that crucifixes of wood had so much feeling in them that they could shed tears. But we must pardon them this fault; they were ashamed to think that their images could do less than had been done by those of the heathen. The heathen pretended that their idols occasionally wept, and these crucifixes, therefore, must receive the same right, and be put on an equal footing!

With regard to the Virgin Mary, as they give out that her body is not on the earth, they are of course prevented from pretending to have her bones; were it otherwise, I can well believe they would have given her a body of such a size as would suffice to fill a thousand sarcophaguses. What is denied with reference to the whole body, they have endeavoured to compensate by hair and milk. Some hairs are shown at Rome, in the church of Mary supra Mi-

Digitized by Google

nerva, at St Salvator's in Spain, at Mascon, at Clugny, at Nocera, at Sanflor, at St James's, and many other places. As to the milk, it cannot be necessary to enumerate all the places where it is shown. Indeed, the task would be endless, for there is no town, however small, no monastery or nunnery, however insignificant, which does not possess it, some in less, and others in greater quantities; not that they would have been ashamed to have it in hogsheads, but they thought the lie might be more plausible if they had only a small quantity,—as much, for instance, as could be contained in a small gallipot or phial; for in this form it can be kept back from minute inspection. But had the breasts of the most Holy Virgin yielded a more copious supply than is given by a cow, or had she continued to nurse during her whole lifetime, she scarcely could have furnished the quantity which is exhibited. Again, I would fain know how that milk, which is at present almost everywhere exhibited, was collected, so as to be preserved until our time. We do not read of any person who had the curiosity to undertake the task. We read, indeed, that the shepherds worshipped Christ, and that the Magians presented gifts to him, but we nowhere read of her having given milk as a kind of return for their presents. Luke relates the prophecy which Simeon made to the Virgin; but he does not say that Simeon asked her to give him some milk. If the matter be only looked to, it will be unnecessary to offer any argument for the purpose of showing how utterly devoid of reason, and all appearance of probability, this wild dream is. It is strange how it never occurred to them to pare her nails, and get other things of that kind, when there was nothing else of the body they could get; but perhaps it was impossible for them to mind every thing.

The other relics of the Virgin, which they boast of having, form part of her wardrobe and baggage. First, there is a shirt at Chartrain, which is a very celebrated object of idolatry, and there is another at Acqs in Germany. It is needless to ask where they found them; for it is most certain that the Apostles and other pious men were not so

Digitized by Google

foolish as to occupy their minds with such frivolities. But let its form only be examined, and I will instantly succumb, if the imposture does not become visible even to the eye. At Acqs, where is one of the shirts we have mentioned, it is carried round in solemn state fastened to a pole, and is as long as a white surplice. Had the Virgin been of the race of the giants, I don't believe she would have had so long a shirt. To give more importance to the exhibition, they, at the same time, produce shoes belonging to St Joseph, which would only fit a boy or a dwarf. There is an old proverb, "A liar should have a good memory." That proverb has been little attended to here; for so short has been their memory, that they have forgotten to attend to the measure of the husband's shoes and his wife's shirt. Now, let them run about, and, with the greatest veneration, kiss their relics which have not the least semblance of being genuine. I know of only two gowns, one at Treves, in the church of St Maximin, and another at Lisia in Italy. I should like much to examine them, that it might be seen what kind of web they are made of, and whether it is such as the Jews of that period were wont to weave. I should like also that the two gowns were compared together, to ascertain whether there is any similarity between them. At Bonne there is a certain scarf. Some one will ask me if I think it is fictitious. I answer, that I have the same opinion of it that I have of the two girdles, the one of which is at Prague, and the other at St Iago of Montserrat, and also of the slipper which is at St James's, and the shoe at Sanflor. But if there were no other objection, every person not absolutely sunk in ignorance is aware that the pious had no such custom as that of collecting shoes and sandals, in order to make relics of them, and that for 500 years after the Virgin's decease not one of these things was ever heard of. What need, therefore, for farther discussion, as if the matter were at all doubtful?

Nay, they have even thought proper to calumniate the most holy Virgin, by representing her as excessively

Digitized by Google

careful about decking her person, and combing her hair; for they show two combs that belonged to her. One of them is in St Martin's at Rome, the other in St John's at Besançon. It is probable there are a great many more in other places. If this is not to hold up the holy Virgin to derision, I know not what derision is. Moreover, they have not forgotten her marriage-ring, which is to be seen at Perugia. Because it is now customary with us for the husband at marriage to present his bride with a ring, they have imagined, without making more inquiry about the matter, that it was customary also at that time. What they have adopted for this purpose is a beautiful ring of great value, never thinking of the great poverty in which the Virgin spent her life. Of her wardrobe, part is seen at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, of St Barbara, of Mary supra Minerva, and part at Blois, and also at St Salvator's in Spain; at least, they boast of having some fragments of them there. I have also heard other places mentioned, but they escape my memory. To detect the imposture, it were only necessary to inspect the texture of this clothing. They seem to have imagined it as easy for the Virgin to put herself in full dress, as it is for them to deck their idols, which they are ever and anon furnishing with new attire.

It remains to speak of pictures—not pictures in general, but those which are specially celebrated for some singular quality. And, first, they pass off an imposture in the name of Luke, pretending that he painted four pictures of the Virgin, and that these are now at Rome. In the church of St Mary the Immaculate one of them is shown at the altar, where it is hung up, as they say, in devotion to her, together with the ring which Joseph gave her on her espousals. Another is shown at Rome also, in the church of Mary Nova, and is said to have been painted by Luke at Troas, and brought thither by an angel. Another is in the church of St Mary called Aracali, and is in the form of a cross. But at the church of St Augustine they give out that they have the most remarkable of all; for if they are to

Digitized by Google

be credited, it is one which Luke carried constantly about with him, and even wished to be put into his coffin when he died. What blasphemy, I ask, to convert a holy evangelist of God into an impious idolator? And what pretence have they for holding that Luke was a painter? Paul calls him a physician, but on what grounds they assign to him skill in painting I have not the least idea. Even if it were true that he practised this art, it is not a whit more probable that he would have painted the Virgin than that he would have painted Jupiter or Venus, or any other idol. It certainly was not the practice at that period for Christians to have idols, nor was it introduced till long after, when the Church had been corrupted with superstition. Again, every corner of the globe is filled with pictures said to have been painted by Luke, as at Cambray, and many other places. And in what form? in such colours as one might be expected to employ in painting an abandoned woman. God hath so blinded them that they have shown no more consideration in this matter than the beasts that perish. However, it does not seem strange to me that they have attributed pictures of the Virgin to Luke, since they have practised similar imposition in the name of Jeremiah. Evidence of their impudence in this respect may be seen at Puteus, a town of Auvergne. Now, I should have thought it time for miserable men to open their eyes, and see through a matter so transparent. I say nothing of Joseph, though some are said to have his shoes, as at Treves, in the monastery of Simeon, and others to have his sandals, while to others are reserved his bones. The specimens already given should be a sufficient exposure of the absurdity.

I must, however, add the case of the archangel Michael, and his attendance on the Virgin Mary. It will be thought I am in jest when I speak of the relics of an angel. Comedians and players have laughed at this, but monkish and priestly impostors have not, therefore, ceased to deceive the people in good earnest. For the inhabitants of Carcassone boast that they have relics belonging to him, as do also those of Tours, in their church of St Julian. In the great

Digitized by Google

church of St Michael, which is frequented by crowds of pilgrims, they show his dagger, which looks very much like the one boys play with. They show also his shield, which in appearance exactly corresponds with the dagger, resembling the brass circles which are put upon horses' harness. Assuredly there is no man and no old woman so dull as not to see how ridiculous those things are. But because the lies are covered with the veil of religion, the iniquity of thus deriding God and angels is not perceived. Some may here object the express declaration of Scripture, that Michael fought with the devil. True; but if the devil were to be vanquished, it behoved to be with a stronger and a sharper sword than that one. Are they so brutish as to imagine that the war which both angels and believers wage with devils is carnal, and carried on with daggers and sharp weapons? But it is just as I have observed before: mankind have richly deserved, by their brutish stupidity, to be so deceived, while with perverse eagerness they have gone about in all directions collecting idols and images, to which they might give worship, instead of giving it to the living God.

To proceed in order, we must now consider the case of John the Baptist, who, according to the account given in the Gospel, that is, according to the truth of God, after being beheaded, was buried by his disciples. Theodoret relates that his sepulchre, which was at Sebastia, a town of Syria, was some time afterwards opened by the heathen, who burned the body, and scattered the ashes to the wind. It is true, indeed, Eusebius adds, that some inhabitants of Jerusalem came and secretly carried off a portion, which they removed to Antioch, and which Athanasius afterwards inclosed within a wall. Sozomen wrote that the head was conveyed to Constantinople by the Emperor Theodosius. The testimony of ancient history, therefore, is, that the whole body was burned, with the exception of the head, and that all the bones and all the ashes were scattered, except a very small portion, which was carried off by some hermits of Jerusalem. Now, let us see how much is said to be extant. The people of Amiens say that they have the

Digitized by Google

front part of the head; and in the skull exhibited by them a wound appears, which they say Herodias inflicted with a knife. The inhabitants of Joannes Angelicus contradict them, and show the very same part. But the remainder of the head, viz., that reaching from the forehead back to the neck, was formerly in Rhodes, and is now, I think, in Malta; at least the Templars did pretend that it was restored to them by the Turks. The back of the head is at Nevers, and the brain at Novium Rantroviensis.[1] And yet, notwithstanding, part of the head is in the church of Joannes Morienus. Then his jaws are at Besançon, in the church of John the Elder. Another part is at Paris, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, and the tip of the ear is at Sanflor, in Auvergne, while the forehead and the hair is in St Salvator's, in Spain. At Noyon, also, is a certain portion, which is wont to be exhibited in great state. There is also a part, but I know not what, at Lucca. Is all this true? Go to Rome, and you will hear that the whole head of John is in the monastery of Sylvester. Poets feign that in Spain there once lived a king, named Geryon, who had three heads. If our fabricators of relics could say the same thing of John the Baptist, it would be a great help to their lies. But since there is no room for such a fable, to what excuse will they resort? I am unwilling to press them so far as to ask how his head was cut into such minute portions as to become capable of distribution in so many various places, or how they got it out of Constantinople. I only say that John must have been a monster, or that they are impudent impostors in exhibiting so many fragments of his head.

But this is not the worst. For the people of Sienna say that they have got his arm, an allegation contradicted, as we have already observed, by all ancient history. Nevertheless, the imposture is tolerated, nay even approved; for in the

[1] The words in the original are Novii Rantroviensis. The translator has not been successful in finding the modern name. It is probably a misprint, as it is not found in Hoffman, or any of the usual Dictionaries.

Digitized by Google

kingdom of Antichrist nothing is thought wicked which tends to increase the superstition of the people. Besides, they have invented another fable, viz., that when his body was burned, the finger with which he pointed out Christ to his two disciples remained entire, and was not injured in the least. But this not only does not accord with ancient history, but may easily be confuted by it. For Eusebius and Theodoret relate that when the Gentiles seized the body it was all consumed to the very bones. Assuredly, had anything so miraculous happened with regard to the finger, they would not have omitted to mention it; for in other respects they are rather too fond of narrating such trifles. But supposing the fact to be as alleged, let us see for a little where this finger is to be found. There is one at Besançon, in the church of John the Great, another at Tholouse, another at Lyons, another at Bourges, another at Florence, and another at the church of Fortuitus, near Mascon. All I would do here is to ask my readers not to harden themselves against evidence so clear and certain—not to close their eyes in such bright light, and allow themselves to be led astray, as it were, in the dark. If there were jugglers, who could so impose on our eyesight as to make it appear that there were six fingers on one hand, we would yet guard cautiously against imposture, and try to detect it. Here, however, there is nothing that even looks like a clever trick. The whole question is, whether we are to believe that the same one finger of John is at Florence, and in five other places, as at Lyons, Bourges, and other towns; or, to state the matter in fewer words, whether we are to believe that six fingers make no more than one finger, or that one finger makes six? I have mentioned only places that are known to me, but I doubt not that, if inquiry were made, as many more would be discovered, and that fragments of the head also would be found of bulk sufficient to make up the head of an ox. But that nothing might be omitted, they pretend that they have got his ashes also, some of them being at Genoa, and others at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis.

Digitized by Google

The historical account is, that they were scattered to the winds. How does this agree with what is said, especially by the Genoese?

It now remains to consider certain articles which are a kind of accessories of the body, for instance, the shoe which is at Paris in the monastery of the Carthusians. It was stolen some twelve or fifteen years ago, but another forthwith made its appearance; and, indeed, so long as shoemakers exist there will be no want of such relics. They give out that in the church of Joannes Lateranensis at Rome they have got his girdle, of which there is no mention in Scripture. It is only said that he had his raiment of camel's hair. This raiment they choose to convert into a girdle. They say they have also in the same place the altar in which he said his prayers in the desert, as if at that time it had been the custom to erect altars in every place, and on every occasion. It is strange they do not also make him perform mass. At Avignon they have the sword with which his head was cut off, and at Acqs, in Germany, the linen cloth which was placed under him in the act of beheading him. How, I would fain know, was there so much kindness and civility in the executioner as to cover the bottom of the dungeon with a carpet at the time he was going to put the Baptist to an ignominious death? I would also like to know how these things happened to come into their hands. Is it probable that the executioner, whether he were a courtier or a common soldier, gave the linen cloth and his sword, that they might be converted into relics? As they wished to make the collection of relics so very perfect, they have blundered sadly in overlooking the knife with which Herodias is said to have wounded him in the eye, and likewise all the blood that must have been spilt, together with his tomb. But perhaps the mistake is in me. It is quite possible that these famous articles are exhibited in places I am not acquainted with.

Now let the Apostles come forward in order. Their

Digitized by Google

number, however, may beget confusion; and, therefore, the better course will be to take Paul and Peter by themselves, and afterwards proceed to the rest. Their bodies are at Rome, half at St Peter's, and half at St Paul's, Sylvester having, it is said, weighed them to make sure of an equal division. The heads of both are in the church of Joannes Lateranensis, though in the same church there is a tooth of Peter existing separately by itself. Though these things are so, it does not prevent them from being in other places also, as at Poictiers, where they have Peter's cheek-bone and his beard. At Treves they have many bones belonging to both, and at Argenton, in Berri, they have Paul's shoulder. But the thing is endless. Wherever there are churches dedicated to them, they have their relics in abundance. If it be asked, what kind of relics? let them call to mind what kind of a one the brain of St Peter was which I formerly mentioned, and which stood on the high altar of this city. As it turned out to be a pumice stone, so, on inquiry, it will be found, that many of the bones which are attributed to these Apostles are those either of horses or dogs.

Then come the things belonging to the bodies, as accessories. For instance, there is a shoe at St Salvator's in Spain, but of what form and material I am unable to say. But the probability is, that it is an article of a similar description to the shoes which they have at Poictiers, and which are made of polished leather, ornamented with gold. See how splendidly they have adorned him after death, to compensate for the poverty in which he passed his life! As the Bishops of the present day, in representing pontifical majesty, are so splendidly clothed, it would seem to derogate from the dignity of the Apostles, were not something of the same nature attributed to them. True! painters can draw pictures in what colours they please, decking them from top to toe in varied attire, and then give them the name of Peter and Paul, or any other name; but every body knows the kind of clothing which they actually had in this world, and that it was no better than

Digitized by Google

that which is usually worn by the poor. They have also at Rome the episcopal chair in which Peter sat, together with the sacerdotal robe in which he used to say mass, as if Bishops had at that time sat on thrones. Their business rather was to teach, comfort, and exhort in public and private, and make themselves ensamples to the flock; not to show themselves to the people to be adored by them, as the prelates of our day are wont to do. With regard to the robe for mass, the custom of masking after the manner of players was not then introduced; for plays were not then acted in the Church as they are now. Wherefore, in order to prove that Peter was dressed in a missal robe, they must first show that when he worshipped God he performed the part of a player like the Popish priests. It was natural enough for them to give him a missal robe, as they had previously given him an altar; but there is no more plausibility in the one than in the other. What kind of masses was then celebrated is well known; for the Apostles in their time only celebrated the Lord's Supper, and for this no altar was necessary. That kind of monstrosity called a mass was altogether unknown, and continued to be unknown for long after. Hence it is clear, that these men, in fabricating their relics, must have supposed they were never to meet with an opponent; so shamelessly and extravagantly have they dared to lie. And yet they are not agreed among themselves as to that altar. For the Romans say that they have it, while the people of Pisa also show it in their suburb which faces the sea.

But that they might lose no possible means of making profit, they have not forgotten the sword with which the ear of Malchus was cut off, as if it were some fair ornament worthy of being preserved as a relic. I have omitted to mention the staff which is shown at Paris in the church of St Stephen á Pierre, and which is in as high repute as the altar and missal robe, and just for as good a reason. As to the staff, there is somewhat more plausibility in it, as it is not unlikely he may have used a staff in travelling; but then they throw every thing into confusion, by not

Digitized by Google

agreeing among themselves about it. For the inhabitants of Cologne, and likewise those of Treves, contend for the possession of it. While they accuse each other of falsehood, they furnish us with good grounds for not giving credit to either. As to the chain with which Peter was bound I say nothing. It is shown at Rome in the church which bears its name. Nor do I say anything of the pillar on which he was beheaded, and which is shown in the church of St Anastasius. I only leave my readers to reflect how that chain must have been procured for the purpose of being converted into relics, and also whether, at that time, it was customary for executions to take place upon pillars.

We will now consider the case of the other Apostles jointly, and will dispose of it in a very few words. And first, we will mention where the whole bodies are, that by comparing them together, it may be seen what certainty can be had in reference to the things said of them. Everybody knows that the inhabitants of Tholouse think that they have got six of these bodies, viz., those of James the Greater, Andrew, James the Less, Philip, Simeon, and Jude. The body of Matthias is at Padua, that of Matthew, at Salerno, of Thomas, at Ortona, and of Bartholomew, at Naples, or somewhere in that district. Now, let us attend to those who have had two or three bodies. For Andrew has another body at Melfi, Philip and James the Less have each another body at the church of the Holy Apostles, and Simeon and Jude, in like manner, at the church of St Peter. Bartholomew has also another in the church dedicated to him at Rome. So here are six who have each two bodies, and also by way of a supernumerary, Bartholomew's skin is shown at Pisa. Matthias, however, surpasses all the rest, for he has a second body at Rome, in the church of the Elder Mary, and a third one at Treves. Besides, he has another head, and another arm, existing separately by themselves. There are also fragments of Andrew existing at different places, and quite sufficient to make up half a body. For his head is at Rome, at the church of St Peter, a shoulder in that of

Digitized by Google

Grisgon, a rib in that of St Eustathius, an arm in that of the Holy Spirit, and some other part in the church of St Blaise. There is also a foot at Aix. Were all these joined together, and properly fitted, they would make up two quarters of the body. But as Bartholomew left his skin at Pisa, so also he has left one of his heads at Treves, and some other member, I know not what. He has also a finger at Frene, while some other relics of them exist also at Rome, in the church of St Barbara. Thus, there is not only no want, but a superfluity in his case. The others are not so well supplied, yet each of them has somewhat to spare. For Philip has one foot at Rome, in the church of the Holy Apostles; also in the church of St Barbara he has I know not what relics, besides these which he has at Treves. In these two last churches he has James for his companion; for James, in like manner, has a hand in the church of St Peter, an arm in that of Grisgon, and another in that of the Holy Apostles. Matthew and Thomas have been left poorer than the rest. For the former has only one body, together with a few bones at Treves, and an arm at Rome, in the church of St Marcellus, and a head in that of St Nicholas, unless there be some which have escaped me. This is very likely; for how can one avoid losing one's self in such a labyrinth?

Finding in their legends that the body of the Evangelist John vanished as soon as it had been consigned to the earth, it has been impossible for them to produce his bones, but they have endeavoured to compensate the matter in another way, by making a rush at all the articles connected with him. And the first thing which occurred to them is the cup out of which he drank poison after he was condemned by Domitian. But as two cities lay claim to it, we must either give implicit credit to what alchymists tell us of multiplication, or these people with their cup have played off a hoax on the world. There is one at Boulogne, and another at Rome, in the church of Joannes Lateranensis. Next, they have laid

Digitized by Google

hold of his tunic, and the chain with which he was bound when he was brought from Ephesus, together with the oratory in which he prayed while he was in prison. I should like to know, whether at this time he hired carpenters to make an oratory for him, and also what intimacy between Christians and his jailors enabled them to obtain the chain from them, and so give it a place among their relics. These things are too absurd even to amuse children. But the most extraordinary articles of all are the twelve apostolic combs, which are exhibited in the church of Mary Insulan, near Lyons. I believe they were placed there at first with the intention of exhibiting them as combs which belonged to twelve peers of France, but their dignity afterwards having increased, they became apostolic.

The other things must be briefly dispatched; for otherwise we should never be able to get out of this forest. We shall merely mention a few of the alleged relics of saints who lived in the days of our Saviour, and then mention a few of those of the ancient martyrs and others. In this way my readers will be able to judge for themselves. Anna, mother of the Virgin Mary, has one of her bodies at Apte in Provence, and another in the church of Mary Insulan at Lyons. Besides, she has one of her hands at Treves, another at Turin, and a third in a town of Thuringia, which takes its name from it. I say nothing of the fragments which exist in more than a hundred places. Among others, I remember having myself, long ago, kissed a portion of it at Ursicampus, a monastery in the vicinity of Noyon, where it is held in great reverence. Lastly, another of her arms is in St Paul's at Rome. Here, if it be possible, let some certainty be shown.

We now come to Lazarus, and his sister the Magdalene. He, as far as I know, has only three bodies; one at Marseilles, another at Austum, a third at Avallon. Between these towns there was a great controversy, but after large sums were expended on both sides, they left the matter as it was, each continuing to maintain its claims.

Digitized by Google

Magdalene being a female, it was necessary to make her inferior to her brother, and, therefore, she has only two bodies, one of which is at Vesoul, near Auxerre, and another, which is of greater renown, at San Maximin, a town of Provence, where also her head exists separately, together with what is called the *Noli me tangere*, which is a bit of wax, but is said to be the mark of a blow which our Saviour gave her in anger when she wished to touch him. I need not advert to the relics of her bones and hair, which are scattered over the world. Those who wish to know the certainty of all these things, should first inquire whether Lazarus, and his sisters Martha and Magdalene, ever came to France for the purpose of preaching the gospel. For if ancient history be read and examined with judgment, it will be seen that this is the most stupid of all fables, and has not the least shadow of plausibility. Yet the relics of Lazarus and Mary are the best authenticated relics of all. Be this as it may, was it not enough to pervert one body to idolatry, instead of proceeding, according to the common saying, to make three devils out of one?

In like manner, they have given a place among their deities to him who pierced the side of our Lord when on the cross, and have called him Longinus, a puerile blunder certainly. This name in Greek signifies a *spearman*, but they have laid hold of it and converted it into the proper name of an individual. After thus naming him, they have given him two bodies, one of which is at Mantua, and the other at the church of Mary Insulan at Lyons. They have done the same with the Magians who came to worship Christ after his birth. And first they have fixed the number of them, maintaining that there were three only. The Gospel nowhere says how many there were, while some of the ancient doctors, for instance, the writer of an unfinished Commentary on Matthew, which is sometimes attributed to Chrysostom, affirms that there were fourteen. The Evangelist calls them Magians, that is, philosophers, but they have taken it upon them to give them royal dignity, though

Digitized by Google

without kingdom or subjects. And lastly, they have given them names, calling the one Belthasar, the other Melchior, and the other Gaspar. However, if we may be permitted to interfere with their fables, it is most certain that these philosophers returned to the East. This the Scripture expressly declares; and there is no ground at all for any other belief than that they died there. Who was it that afterwards transferred them from those regions? Who knew them so well, that he could identify their bodies, for the purpose of being converted into relics? But I desist. It is foolish to engage in refuting such absurdities. All I say is, that the inhabitants of Cologne and of Milan should be left to litigate among themselves as to which of the two is to possess them. Both claim them, and it is impossible that both can be right. When once they bring their law-suit to a close, it will be time to see what should be done.

Among ancient martyrs, Dionysius is particularly celebrated; for he is held to be a disciple of the Apostles, and the first evangelist of the French. On this account relics of him are preserved in many places, while his body exists entire in two places only, viz., St Denis and Ratisbon. Because the French claimed him exclusively to themselves, the people of Ratisbon raised an action against them at Rome about a hundred years ago, and the body was adjudged to them by a definitive sentence, while the Legate of France was personally present, and a very fine Bull to this effect was given to them. But should any person go to St Denis, which is in the neighbourhood of Paris, and deny that the body is there, he would be stoned. At the same time, should any one deny that it is at Ratisbon, he would be counted a heretic; for his denial would be rebellion against the Apostolic See. The prudent plan, therefore, will be not to meddle with their disputes. Let them tear out each other's eyes if they will; the utmost they will gain will be to prove that the whole matter is a lie.

The body of Stephen they have so dissected, that, though it is entire at Rome, in the church which bears his name, the head is at Arles, and bones are in more than two hundred

Digitized by Google

places; while, as if to show their approval of those who put him to death, they have consecrated even the stones by which he was murdered. It will, perhaps, be asked how they could be identified, where they were found, and out of whose hands they were recovered? I give this short reply, that it is a foolish question. There could be no difficulty in finding them, wherever stones are found, and the carriage is not costly, as at Florence, at Arles, in the monastery of the Augustins, and at Vigeon, in Aquitaine. Any one who chooses to shut his eyes, and deprive himself of all understanding, will believe that they are the very stones that stoned Stephen; while he, again, who will give some little heed to the matter, will laugh. But assuredly the Carmelites of Poictiers, within the last fourteen years, possessed one to which they assigned the office of assisting women in labour, and easing their pains. The Dominicans, from whom one, destined like a pearl for the same purpose, had been stolen, had a mighty quarrel with them, and bawled out imposture; but the Carmelites, by fighting stoutly, came off victorious.

I had almost determined to be silent concerning the Innocents, as they call them; for although I could muster something like an army of them, it might always be alleged that there is nothing in this contradictory to history, because their exact number has not been defined. Therefore, I will say nothing of their numbers. Only let it be observed, that there is not a region of the world where some of them are not said to exist. I would ask, however, in what manner, after so long an interval, their graves were discovered, more especially as they were not regarded as saints till Herod slew them. I would also ask, when were they brought hither? The only answer which can be given is, that it was five or six hundred years after their death. Any person, however ignorant and illiterate, may judge what the result will be if credit is given to such wild dreams. Moreover, even if these Innocents could have been discovered, how could such a number of their bodies have been imported into France, Germany, and Italy, so as to be distri-

Digitized by Google

buted amongst cities so remote from each other? This imposture, therefore, I leave as clearly established.

As Lawrence is included in the list of ancient martyrs, we will here assign a place to him. I do not know, indeed, that his body is in more than one place, viz., at Rome, in the church which bears his name; but there is a separate vase filled with his ashes, and likewise two jugs, the one filled with his blood, and the other with his fat. Moreover, an arm and bones are in the church which bears the name of Palisperna, and other relics in the church of St Sylvester. But were all the bones collected which are in France alone, I have no doubt that two complete bodies might be formed out of them. There also is the gridiron on which he was roasted, although Palisperna, which we have mentioned, boasts of having a fragment of it. In regard to the gridiron I could pardon them; but there are other more notable relics as to which it were unlawful to be silent, I mean the coals which are shown at the church of St Eustathius, and the towel with which an angel is said to have wiped his body. Since they have idled away their time in devising dreams of this nature to impose upon the world, let those who read this Admonition take time for due consideration, and, by so doing, consult for themselves, and guard against being so imposed upon in future. Of the same manufacture is the dalmatic, which is also shown at Rome, in the church of St Barbara. Having heard that Lawrence was a deacon, they imagined that he decked himself in a vesture similar to that which metamorphoses their deacons when they play their part in the mass. But the office of deacon in the ancient Church was a very different thing from what it now is in the Papacy. Deacons were then elected to take charge of the poor and distribute alms, not to be a kind of stage-players, and, consequently, had no need whatever of dalmatics or similar maskings.

To Lawrence we will join Gervasius and Protasius, whose tomb existed at Milan in the days of Ambrose, as he himself testifies, and likewise Jerome, Augustine, and many others. Accordingly, the Milanese even now lay claim to their

Digitized by Google

bodies, which are nevertheless at Brissac, in Germany, and at Besançon, in the church of St Peter, besides an endless number of fragments scattered up and down in various churches of the world. Each of them must, therefore, have had at least three or four bodies, or we must discard the bones which now falsely pass under their name.

In assigning to Sebastian the office of curing the plague, their object was to bring him into high esteem, and so make him be more eagerly sought after. The consequence has been, that his one body has been multiplied into four bodies, one of which is at Rome, in the church of St Lawrence, a second at Soissons, a third at Pilignum, in Brittany, and a fourth near Narbonne, the place of his birth. He has, moreover, two heads—one at Rome, in the church of St Peter, and another at Toulouse, in the possession of the Dominicans. Both heads, however, are empty, if credit is to be given to the Franciscans of Angers, who give out that they have his brain. Nay, these Dominicans have also an arm. There is also another at Toulouse, in the church of Saturninus, another at Casede, in Auvergne, another at Brissac, in Germany, beside minute fragments which exist in various churches. When all these things have been well considered, let any one guess where the body of Sebastian really is. Not contented, however, with these, they have made relics of the arrows with which he was pierced. One of them is shown at Lambesc, in Provence, another at Poictiers, while others are scattered up and down in various places. The whole makes it plain that they had taken it for granted that they were never to be called to account for their impostures.

The same multiplication of relics has prevailed in the case of Anthony. By pretending that he is passionate and mischievous, and inflames those who may have given him offence, they have made him an object of dread; from this dread has arisen a superstitious desire to possess his body, and so have a security against harm. Accordingly, the city of Arles had a keen and tedious litigation on the subject with the monks of St Anthony at Vienne. The result was just

Digitized by Google

that which usually takes place in controversies of this description; that is, the whole matter still remains in darkness. Indeed, had any thing been actually proved on the subject, and the truth been made manifest, it would not have been to the advantage of either party. To these two bodies they have added a knee, which is in the Vivarais, in the possession of the Augustins; besides various members which exist at Bourges, Mascon, Dijon, Chalons, Ovron, and Besançon, and others, which are everywhere hawked about by travelling impostors. Of these the number is not small. See what it is to get a name for doing mischief. But for this, that good saint would still be in his tomb, or, at least, concealed in some corner.

I have omitted St Petronilla, Peter's daughter, whose entire body is in the church dedicated to her father, besides some separate remains in the church of Saint Barbara; nevertheless, another body is in the possession of the people of La Maine, in the monastery of the Dominicans, and is held in the very highest repute, because alleged to cure fever.

As there were various saints of the name of Susanna, I cannot say whether they have thought proper to give two bodies to any one of them. There is one body of a Susanna at Rome, in the church which bears her name, and there is another at Toulouse. Helen has not been so highly favoured. The Venetians have the body, but in addition to it, she has not gained any superfluous part, with the exception of another head which exists at Cologne in the church of Grisgon. In this respect St Ursula has the advantage of her. For, first, she has her body in the church of St John the Angel; then she has one head at Cologne, and part of another with the Dominicans of La Maine, as also the Dominicans of Tours, and at Bergers. Of her companions, to whom they give the name of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, whatever may be thought, it must, at least, be admitted, that by feigning them to be so numerous, they have enabled themselves to lie with greater freedom. Beside the bones which are at Cologne, and which would be quite sufficient to load an

Digitized by Google

hundred waggons, there is scarcely a city in Europe which does not possess them as the ornament of one or more of their churches.

Were I to take a survey of the common herd of saints, I should get entangled in a forest out of which I should never be able to escape. It will be sufficient, therefore, to adduce some specimens, from which a judgment may be formed in regard to the rest. There are two churches in Poictou which contend for the body of Hilary, viz., the cathedral church dedicated to him, and that of the Monks at Selle. The controversy is at present awaiting the visitation which is to take place. In the interval, the idolaters will be forced to worship two bodies as those of the same individual; whereas true believers, feeling no anxiety whatever about his body, will allow it to rest, be it where it may. The body of St Honoratus is at Arles, and is also in the Island of Lerins near Antiboul. Ægidius has one of his bodies at Toulouse, and another in a town at Aquitaine, which is named after him. William is in a monastery of Aquitaine, which is called St William in the Desert, and also in a town of Holstein, which is called Ecrichum, where also his head exists separately, although he has also another head in the suburb of Tours, among the Williamites. What shall I say of Symphorianus, whose body and bones exist in so many places? Also of Lupus, which is at Auxerre, at Sienna, at Lyons, and which they have also pretended to be at Geneva? What likewise shall I say of Ferreolus, whose whole body is at Uzes in Aquitaine, and also at Brioude in Auvergne? Not to betray their lies so openly, they ought, at least, to enter into an arrangement, as the monks of Treves have done, as to their dispute with those of Lodi about the head of Lambert. They have agreed as to the offerings, by compounding, for a certain sum of money, with this condition, however, that the body possessed by the former shall not be publicly exhibited, lest suspicion might be excited by both being seen in two cities so near each other. Thus it is, as I mentioned before at the outset; they never

Digitized by Google

supposed that any observer would appear who would ever dare to open his lips in exposure of such impudence.

But any one may ask, how have these fabricators of relics omitted the many notable things connected with the Old Dispensation, since, without any regard to reason, they have heaped up all that ever came into their mind, and, as it were with a breath, called into existence whatever they pleased? To this question I can give no other answer than that they did not think it worth their while, because they had no prospect of deriving much advantage from such relics; and yet they have not forgotten them entirely, for at Rome they gave out that they have the bones of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the church of Mary supra Minerva. They also boast that in the church of Joannes Lateranensis they have the ark of the covenant and Aaron's rod within it. The same rod, however, is at Paris in the Holy Chapel, while some fragment of it also is in St Salvator's in Spain. I omit the inhabitants of Bourdeaux, who maintain that the rod of St Martial, which is exhibited in the church of Severinus, is the identical rod of Aaron. It would seem that they had wished to perform a new miracle as in rivalship of God; for whereas He, by his power, turned the rod into a serpent, so they have now turned it into three rods. Very probably they have many other toys of the same description, but let it suffice merely to have mentioned this, in order to make it manifest that they have been as honest here as in other matters.

Now, I would entreat my readers to remember what I said at the outset, viz., that I have not searchers at hand to examine the *sacraria* of all the regions which I have here mentioned. Wherefore, what I have said of relics must not be taken as if it were a perfect inventory of all the things which might be discovered. I have mentioned only six German cities, or thereabouts, three, as far as I know, of Spain, fifteen of Italy, and between thirty or forty of France; nor am I even acquainted with all the relics

Digitized by Google

that are in them. Let every one, therefore, consider with himself what a farrago there would be if we saw the multitude of relics existing throughout the world described in order, or only in the regions which are known to us, or in which we live. For it is to be particularly observed, that all the relics of Christ and the Apostles exhibited in Europe exist also in Greece, Asia, and other countries where Christian churches are found. Now, I ask, when the Christians of the Eastern Church say that all these things which we pretend to have are in their possession, what decision can we come to upon the subject? If, in answer to them, we aver that this body was brought thither by merchants—that one by monks—and that other by a bishop—that part of the crown of thorns was sent by the Emperor of Constantinople to the King of France—that another was obtained in war—and so on of each, they will laugh and shake their heads. How will the controversy be decided? In doubtful matters we must trust to conjecture, and, therefore, in this respect, they will always get the better of us. For what they produce in their behalf is much more probable than what we can produce in ours. Those who defend relics have certainly a very difficult knot to loose.

To draw to a conclusion, I beseech my readers, in the name of God, to give heed to the truth while it lies plainly before them, and recognise how Divine Providence has wonderfully provided, that those who thus wished to mislead the meanest of the people have been so blind that they never thought of using a cloak for their lies, but moving blindfolded, like the Midianites, have set about slaughtering one another. As we see how they are still warring among themselves, and charging each other with falsehood, every man, who is not obstinately determined against the truth, though he may not yet clearly perceive that the worship of any relics, of whatever kind they be, whether genuine or spurious, is execrable idolatry, yet seeing how clear their falsehood is, will have no desire to kiss them any more, and

Digitized by Google

whatever reverence they may have previously inspired, will cease to have any relish for them.

The best thing, indeed, would be, as I mentioned at the outset, if, among us who profess the name of Christ, this heathenish custom were abolished, whether they be relics of Christ or of the saints. In as much as they do degenerate into idols, the pollution and defilement which they occasion ought not on any account to be tolerated in the Church. This we have already demonstrated, both by argument and by the testimony of Scripture. If any one is not satisfied with this, let him look to the manner and practice of the ancient fathers, and conform to their example. Many patriarchs, prophets, kings, and other faithful worshippers, existed under the Old Testament. More ceremonies were then appointed by God than it becomes us to observe in the present day. Nay, even burial itself required more show than it now does, because by its figures it represented the resurrection, which was not so clearly revealed to them as it has been to us. But do we read that the saints were ever dug out of their graves, in order that they might be converted into a kind of puppets for children? Was Abraham, the father of all the faithful, thus carried in state, or was Sarah, a princess in the Church of God, taken out of her coffin? Were they not left in quiet along with the other saints, and was not the body of Moses so concealed, by the express will of God, that it never could be discovered? Did not Satan, as Jude tells us, contend for it with the angels? The Lord then withdrew it from the sight of men, and the devil tried to bring it back. God confessedly took it away, in order that it might not become an occasion of idolatry to the Jewish people; and the devil would have brought it back, that he might make it an occasion of idolatry. But that people, it will perhaps be said, was prone to superstition; and what, pray, are we? Is there not in this respect greater perversity among Christians than there was among the Jews? And what do we find to have been the practice of the ancient Church? The faithful, it is true, always

Digitized by Google

exerted themselves to rescue the bodies of martyrs, and prevent their being torn by wild beasts and ravenous birds, so as to secure for them an honourable burial. This they did in the case of John the Baptist and Stephen. They did it, however, for the purpose of committing them to the earth, that they might there rest till the resurrection—not that they might be brought forward into public view in order that all might prostrate themselves before them. This unhappy pomp of consecrating was never introduced into the Church until all things were subverted, and, as it were, profaned, partly by the stupidity or avarice of some prelates and pastors, and partly by the inability of others to withstand a practice which had already begun to prevail. Nay, even the people themselves courted deception, by giving their mind to mere frivolities rather than to the pure worship of God.

Wherefore, if a complete reformation of this corrupt practice is desired, it will be necessary to begin at the very foundation, and abolish a practice which was at first instituted improperly, and against all reason. But if any one is not able at one step to make such an advance towards true understanding, let him at least proceed gradually. And, in the first place, let him open his eyes, and exercise his judgment upon any relics which may be presented to him. No one inclined to make the attempt will find it at all difficult; for among the many transparent lies, such as those to which I have already adverted, where will any relics be found whose genuineness amounts to anything like certainty? Nay, at the very time when this little book was passing through the press, I was informed of a third prepuce, which I had not mentioned, and which is shown at Hildesheim. The number of similar follies is indeed infinite, and a careful inspection would discover more than it is possible to enumerate. Let every one, then, be on his guard, and not allow himself to be led along like an irrational animal, and as if he were incapable of discerning any way or path by which he might be guided safely. I recollect when I

Digitized by Google

was a boy how they were wont to do with the images of our parish. When the feast of Stephen drew near, they adorned them all alike with garlands and necklaces, just decking the murderers who stoned Stephen in the same way as they decked Stephen himself. When the old women saw the murderers thus adorned, they imagined that they were Stephen's companions. Accordingly, every one was presented with his candle. Nay, the same honour was conferred on the devil who contended with Michael, and so on with the rest. And so completely are they all mixed up and huddled together, that it is impossible to have the bones of any martyr without running the risk of worshipping the bones of some thief or robber, or, it may be, the bones of a dog, or a horse, or an ass. Nor can the Virgin Mary's ring, or comb, or girdle, be venerated without the risk of venerating some part of the dress of a strumpet. Let every one, therefore, who is inclined, guard against this risk. Henceforth no man will be able to excuse himself by pretending ignorance.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

INDEX.

Abbots, corrupt lives of, 207, 283.
their seats at General Councils, 226.
Abstinence or fasting, 113, 114, 115.
Abuses in appointment of the Clergy, 55, 197, 204.
Adoration, its true nature, 127.
Alciat, Andrew, Calvin studies law under, xxiii.
Amadeus, his election to the Popedom, 101.
Ambrose, state of the Church in his time, 38.
referred to, 76, 83, 87, 98, 143, 209, 225, 262, 291, 303.
Anabaptists, refuted by Calvin, xxx., xxxvi.
wherein resembling the Pope, 36.
Anastasius, Emperor, 247.
Anthony, Saint, alleged relics of, 294.
Antichrist, 199, 219, 263, 276.
Antidote, Calvin's, to Articles of the Sorbonne, xliii.
to Council of Trent, lii.
Antiochus, his pollution of the Jewish Temple, 213.
Antipopes, 101.
Apostles, succession from, 101, 143, 170, 172, 173.
their mode of ordaining ministers, 142.
true successors of, 143.
alleged relics of, 324–329.
Apostolical canons, 181.
Aquileia, Council of, 207, 225, 260.
Aquinas, Thomas, referred to, 83.
Arius, 223.
Arles, Council of, 260.
Articles of faith, authority of the Church in, 105.
Astrology, Judicial, Calvin's Treatise on, liii.
Atonement of Christ, 42.
Augustine, state of the Church in time of, 38.
referred to, 45, 73, 75, 76, 77, 82, 84, 89, 90, 91, 93, 98, 100, 105, 115, 160, 164, 166, 175, 218, 229, 289.
Auricular Confession, 15, 77, 78, 79, 177.
Authority of the Church, 21, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105.
of the Clergy, 52.

Baptism, its true nature, 73, 74, 75.
corruptions of, 137, 166.
Bâsle, Council of, 102, 107.
Calvin resides at, xxvii.
Bernard, Saint, referred to, 50, 82.
Berne, in Geneva, dispute between, as to unleavened bread, xxxii.
Beza, his stanzas on Calvin, xcvii.
Biography, proper use of, xx., xxi.
Bishops, duty of, 172, 218.
corrupt lives of, 205, 206, 207, 283.
their seats at General Councils, 226.
Blandrata, his heresy, lxxix.
Bolsec, factious proceedings of, lvii., lviii.

Digitized by Google

Bolsec, refuted by Calvin, lviii.
Bourges, Calvin studies law at, xxiii.
Bread, unleavened, dispute as to, xxxii.
Bucer, Calvin's friendship for, lvi.
urges Calvin's return to Geneva, xxxvii.
his death, lvi.

CALENDAR of saints, 190, 191.
Calvin, his birth and parentage, xxi.
his early education, xxi.
studies at the University of Paris, xxi., xxii.
holds a benefice, xxii.
studies law, xxii.
his mode of study, xxiii.
studies Greek, xxiv.
preaches occasionally, xxiv.
writes his Commentary on Seneca De Clementia, xxiv.
devotes himself entirely to religion, xxiv.
resides at Paris, xxiv.
furnishes Nicholas Cop with an oration, xxiv.
invited to the Court of the Queen of Navarre, xxv.
resides at Saintonge, xxv.
publishes his Psychopannychia, xxvi.
leaves France, xxvi.
resides at Bâsle, xxvii.
publishes the first edition of his Institutes, xxvii.
visits the Duchess of Ferrara, xxviii.
passes through Geneva, xxix.
becomes resident at Geneva, xxix.
his Catechism, xxix., xxxviii.
refutes the Anabaptists, xxx., xxxvi.
his writings against the Nicodemites, xxxi., xlix.
his expulsion from Geneva, xxxiii.
teaches theology at Strasburg, xxxiv.
lays the platform of the French Church, xxxiv.
his moderation, xxxiv.
his Reply to Sadolet's Letter, xxxv.
Calvin publishes a new edition of his Institutes, xxxv.
publishes his Commentary on his Epistle to the Romans, xxxv.
his wife, Idelletta, xxxvi.; her death, liv.
his Treatise on the Lord's Supper, xxxvi.
gains over many Anabaptists, xxxvi.
marries, xxxvi.
attends the Diet of Ratisbon, xxxvi.
his recal and return to Geneva, xxxvii., xxxviii.
establishes Presbytery at Geneva, xxxviii.
his ordinary labours, xxxix.
his extraordinary exertions, xxxix.
his style of preaching, xxxix.
his Antidote to the Articles of the Sorbonne, xliii.
his answer to Pighius, xliii.
his Necessity of Reforming the Church, xlv.
his Treatise against the Libertines, xlv.
his courage, li.
his Commentaries on the Epistles of St Paul, liii.
his Letter to the Duke of Somerset, liii.
his Treatise on Judicial Astrology, liii.
draws up an account of predestination, lviii.
refutes the doctrine of Servetus, lxvi.
his Commentary on Genesis, lxvi.
seized with ague, lxx.
his Commentary on the Psalms, lxxi.
seized with quartan fever, lxxvi.
draws up a Confession of Faith for the German Protestants, lxxxi.
his Commentary on the four last books of Moses, lxxxii.
his Commentary on Joshua, lxxxii.
his increasing diseases, lxxxiii.
his will, lxxxv.–lxxxix.

Digitized by Google

Calvin, his address to the Senatus of Geneva, xc.–xciii.
his address to the Pastors of Geneva, xciv.–xcvi.
his last moments, xcvi.
his death, xcvi.
his funeral, xcvii.
stanzas on, by Beza, xcvii.
his personal appearance, xcvii.
his talents and character, xcviii.–c.
Canons, ancient appointment of ministers by, 142.
apostolical, 181.
Cardinals, their seats at a General Council, 226.
Caroli, Peter, xxx., xxxi.
Carthage, Council of, 74, 112, 120, 207, 261.
Castellio, Sebastian, xlii., xliv., lxvi.
Catechism, Calvin's, xxix., xxxviii.
Cecilianus, his dispute with Donatus, 262.
Celibacy, vows of, unlawful, 117, 177, 178, 180, 181.
Ceremonies, undue multiplication of, 39, 132, 151, 167, 168.
of the Old Dispensation, their typical nature, 152.
Chalcedon, Council of, 225, 260, 261.
Charlemagne, alleged cause of his prosperity, 245, 271.
Charles V., his mildness and prudence, 229, 285, 286.
his humanity and wisdom, 230.
Christ, his atonement and satisfaction, 42.
the only Mediator, 130.
priesthood of, how insulted, 191, 192.
pretended relics of, 290, 296, 297, 298.
Chrysostom referred to, 36, 38, 79, 87, 106.
Church, unity of, 20, 29, 72, 211, 215, 217, 259, 266, 273.
authority of, 21, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105.
definition of, 35, 37, 48, 51, 101, 102, 103, 213, 214.
its safety, on what founded, 35, 38.
the extension of, 36.
Church, corruptions of, 37, 125, 129, 131, 221, 222.
state of in time of Augustine, 38; of Cyprian, 38.
government of, 126, 127.
primitive, 37, 149.
ordination of ministers in, 142.
reformation of, 125, 200.
patrimony of, 209, 210.
patrimony of, how abused, 211.
trials of, 10.
Romish, its claim of infallibility, 13.
Romish, not the true Church, 38.
primitive, its satisfactions, what, 45.
how far visible, 101, 102, 103, 104.
Christ, the universal head of, 110, 111.
Pope not the head of, 111.
supposed treasures of, 163.
supposed keys of, 163.
duty of civil governors to protect and reform, 228, 265.
calamitous condition of, 231.
the seed of, 234.
property, duty of princes as to administration of, 264.
Protestants not aliens from the true, 264.
Civil governors, their duty to protect and reform the Church, 228, 265.
Claud, alleged body of, 294.
Clergy, authority of, 52.
abuses in appointment of, 55.
Romish immoralities of, 141, 197, 203, 204, 206, 207, 208.
corrupt appointment of, 197, 204.
Communion in one kind, 86, 87.
Confession, auricular, 15, 77, 78, 79, 177.
the decree of Pope Innocent III., 78, 79.
of Faith for the German Protestants, drawn up by Calvin, lxxxi.
Confirmation, pretended sacrament of, 91.
Consecration by priests, 88.
Constans, Emperor, 246.

Digitized by Google

Constantine the Great, alleged cause of his prosperity, 245, 271.
alleged donation of, 270.
Constantinople, Council of, 260.
Conversion, how produced, 41, 42, 46.
Cop, Nicholas, xxiv.
Corald, xxvi.
Corderius Maturinus, his character, xxi.
Corrupt lives of Abbots, 207, 283.
of Bishops, 205, 206, 207, 283.
Corruptions of baptism, 137, 166.
of the Church. See Church.
Council of Trent, Calvin's Antidote to, lii.
general, authority of, 66, 107.
of Nice, 73, 84, 107, 180, 223, 260, 261.
Carthage, 74, 112, 120, 207, 261.
Lateran, 79, 182.
of Bâsle, 102, 107.
Gangra, 181.
New Cesarea, 181.
of Aquileia, 207, 225, 260.
Chalcedon, 225, 260, 261.
how constituted, 226.
General, 226.
seats of Abbots at, 226.
of Bishops, 226.
calling of, 249, 250.
Arles, 260.
Ephesus, 260.
Constantinople, 260.
power of calling, 260, 261.
probable composition of, 279, 280.
probable treatment of Protestants at, 280.
Cranmer, his martyrdom, lxix.
Cross, alleged relics of, 301, 302, 303.
Cruciger, xxxvi.
Cup, refusal of to Laity, 49.
Cyprian, state of the Church in time of, 38.
referred to, 77, 84, 88, 89, 111, 112, 171, 182, 271, 276.

Dead, prayers for the, 15, 120.
the state of the, 100.
De L'Etoile, Peter, xxii.
Diet of Ratisbon, xxxvi., xxxvii.
Spires, xlv., 328.
Dionysius, Saint, competition for his body, 331.
Discipline, neglect of, 38, 201, 202, 203.
controversy as to, at Geneva, lxii.
strenuous defence of, by Calvin, lxii., lxiii.
Disturbances, religious, Protestant Reformers not accountable for, 185.
Donatists, 223.
Donatus, his controversy with Cecilianus, 262.
Dulia, what, 131.

Election, gratuitous, 44.
Eli, his example, 239, 242, 260.
Emperors, Constantine, 245; Theodosius, 245, 260, 265, 270; Charlemagne, 245, 271; Constans, 246; Anastasius, 247; Frederick I., 273; Frederick II., 246; Leo, 164, 246; Mauritius, 246, 271; Henry, 246; Sigismund, 285.
Ephesus, Council of, 260.
Erasmus refered to, xxxvi., 83.
Eugenius, his deposition from the Popedom, 102.
Eusebius referred to, 98, 321.
Excommunication, 106, 107, 205, 206.
Expiation, spurious, 194.
Expiatory victim, one only, 44.
Extension of the Church, 36.
Extreme unction, pretended sacrament of, 91.

Faith, Confession of, by Calvin, lxxxi.
and works, 9.
justification by, 41, 42, 43, 80, 81, 82, 162.
true, its nature, 53.
Articles of, authority in the Church, 105.
good breach of, 284, 285.
Farel, his birth and family, 30.
introduces the Reformation into Geneva, xxviii., 26.
detains Calvin in passing through Geneva, xxix.
his literary attainments, 30.
accused and acquitted, lxiv.

Digitized by Google

Farel, his style of preaching, xxxix.
Fasting, obligation of, 113–115.
Fathers, the authority of, 66.
Feast days, abolition of, at Geneva, lv.
Ferrara, Duchess of, Calvin's visit to, xxviii.
Flesh, prohibition of, 177.
France, Calvin leaves, xxvi.
Francis I., his bigotry and persecution, xxvi.
Frederick I., Emperor, 273.
II. 246.
Free will, Calvin answers Pighius on, xliii.
how far possessed by man, 75, 76, 77, 159, 160.
how taught before Luther, 134.
French Church, platform of laid by Calvin, xxxiv.
Fulgentius referred to, 84.

GANGRA, Council of, 181.
Gelasius, Pope, 246, 271.
General Council, how constituted, 226.
Genesis, Calvin's Commentary on, lxvi.
Geneva, Reformation introduced into, xxviii., xxix., 26.
Calvin's arrival at, xxix.
Calvin's pastoral relation to the Church of, xxvii.
abjuration of Popery, and solemn adherence to the Reformation, xxix., xxx.
unchristian spirit prevailing at, xxxii.
and Berne, difference between as to unleavened bread, xxxii.
Presbytery established at, xxxviii.
great resort of strangers to, xl.
Calvin's Address to Senatus of, xc–xciii. See Calvin.
Gentilis, Valentine, his heresy, lxxiii., lxxiv.
his feigned repentance, lxxiv.
his condemnation, lxxv.
Germany, calamitous condition of the Church in, 281.
Good works, not meritorious of salvation, 135.
not supplemented by merits of Christ and martyrs, 135.
Gospel, preaching of, its excellence, 36.
Government of the Church, 126, 127.
ecclesiastical importance of, 142.
true nature of, 175.
Governors, Civil, duty to protect and reform the Church, 228, 265.
Gratian referred to, 166.
Gratuitous election, 44.
Greeks, their misery, the causes of, 247, 274.
Gribald, Matthew, his heresies, lxix.

HEADSHIP of the Church, Christ's universal, 110, 111.
Helena, alleged relics procured by, 301, 302, 303.
Henry, Emperor, 246.
Heresy, its true nature, 217.
Hildebrand, Pope, his decision as to transubstantiation, 83, 272.
Hilary referred to, 103, 259.
Holy Spirit and the Word inseparably connected, 36.
Hopper, his martyrdom, lxix.
Hormisdas, Pope, 246, 271.
Human nature, corruption of, 134, 159.
questions as to, by the schoolmen, 234.
Humility, its true nature, 50.
Huss, John, his martyrdom, 285.
Hyperdulia, what, 131.

IDELLETTA, the wife of Calvin, xxxvi.
her death, liv.
Idolatry, prevalence of, in the Romish Church, 131, 291.
heinousness of, 148, 187, 188.
how punished in the Jews, 188.
Idolodulia, 149.
Images, worship of, 79, 131, 148, 188.
pernicious effects of, 98.
Immoralities of the Romish Clergy, 141, 197, 201, 204, 206, 207, 208.
Innocent V., Pope, 79, 182, 224.
Innocents, alleged relics of, 332.
Institutes, Calvin's Christian, first edition of, xxvii.
dedication of, xxvii.
enlarged edition of, xxxv.
Intercession of saints, 47.

Digitized by Google

JEREMIAH, his example, 212.
Jerome referred to, 87, 92, 112, 207, 208.
Jews, how punished for idolatry, 188.
causes of their misery, 247, 274.
Joan, Pope, 101.
John Baptist, alleged relics of, 321, 322, 323, 324.
Joshua, Calvin's Commentary on, lxxxii.
Josiah, his example, 263.
Judgments, divine, grounds of, uncertain, 270.
Judicial Astrology, Calvin's Treatise on, liii.
Justification by faith, 41, 42, 43, 80, 81, 82, 162.
and sanctification, how connected, 43.
Justifying, Scripture meaning of the term, 42.

KEYS of the Church, supposed, 163.
Knowledge of salvation, different stages of, 133, 134.
Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, their example, 243, 267.

LACTANTIUS referred to, 98.
Lælius Socinus, Calvin's letters to, lv.
Laity, refusal of the cup to, 49.
Last Supper, alleged relics of, 299.
Lateran Council, 79, 182.
Latimer, his martyrdom, lxix.
Latin tongue, religious service in, 158.
Latria, what, 131.
Law, Calvin's great progress in the study of, xxii., xxiii.
Lawrence, Saint, alleged relics of, 335.
Lazarus, alleged relics of, 229, 260.
Lefevre, James, of Estaples, xxv.
his prediction of Calvin's eminence,
Leo referred to, 164, 246.
Libertines, Calvin's Treatise against the, xlv.
Lord's Supper. See Supper.
Luther, his exertions to reform the Church, 125, 136, 145, 183, 220.

MACROBIUS referred to, 85.
Magdalene, Mary, alleged relics of, 294, 330.
Man, chief end of his existence, 33, 34.
Marriage, vows against, unlawful, 117, 177, 178, 180, 181.
Martyrs, supplementary merits of, 135.
Mass, pretended sacrifice of, 85, 138, 167, 196.
Masses, traffic in, 49, 194.
Mauritius, Emperor, 246, 271.
Meats, distinction of, 113, 114, 115.
Meekness, to what extent to be cultivated, 198.
Melancthon, xxxvii., xliii., xliv., xlix., liv.
Merit, supplementary, 135.
Milesians, 279.
Ministers, mode of ordaining by the Apostles, 142.
Miracles, pretended, 92, &c.
Mommors, Calvin's education in the family of, xxi.
Monks, their vows and obedience, 116, 117, 180.

NAVARRE, Queen of, invites Calvin to her Court, xxi., xxv.
Necessity of Reforming the Church, xlv.
New Cesarea, Council of, 181.
Nice, Council of, 73, 84, 107, 180, 223, 260, 261.
Nicodemites refuted by Calvin, xxxi., xlix.
Noyon, the birth-place of Calvin, xxi.
Nuns, their vow, 180.

OLIVET, Peter Robert, Calvin's instructor in the reformed faith, xxii.
his translation of the Old Testament, xxii.
Ordination, ministerial form of, 174.
Orleans, Calvin studies law at, xxii., xxiii.

Digitized by Google

Osiander, his heresy, xlvii.
Ovid referred to, 99.

Palladius, 225.
Paris, Parliament of, persecution by, xxiv., xxv.
Calvin studies at University of, xxi., xxii.; resides there, xxiv.
Theological Faculty of the Sorbonne, 71.
Pastoral office, its true nature, 140, 170.
corruption of, 140, 141.
Pastors, election and ordination of, 142.
how appointed in primitive times, 142.
influence of people in appointment of, 171.
how they edify the Church, 29.
Patrimony of the Church, 209, 210
how abused, 211.
Paul, Saint, Epistles of, Calvin's Commentaries on, liii.
III., Pope, 257, 265, 278.
Pelagius, 223, 224.
Penances and satisfactions, no expiation by, 44.
dogma of, 78.
Pentateuch, Calvin's Commentaries on, lxvi., lxxxii.
People, influence of, in the election of Pastors, 171.
Peter, Saint, alleged primacy of, 109–113, 273.
the Pope no successor to, 52, 219.
alleged brain of, 294.
Pier, Luigi, his character, 257.
Pighius, his book on Free Will answered by Calvin, xliii.
Pilgrimages, no sanction for in Scripture, 96.
Pope Innocent V., 79, 182, 224; Hildebrand, 83, 272; Joan, 101; Gelasius, 246, 271; Hormisdas, 246, 271; Paul III., 257, 265, 278; Sylvester, 260.
no successor of Peter, 52, 219.
Pope, not the Head of the Church, 111.
encroachments of, 172.
wherein resembling the Anabaptists, 36.
Prayer, its true nature, 94, 130, 154, 156, 157, 158.
for the dead, 15, 120.
Preaching of the gospel, its excellency, 36.
Predestination, account of, drawn up by Calvin, lviii.
calumnies as to, lxx.
Presbytery established by Calvin at Geneva, xxxvi.
Priesthood of Christ, how insulted, 191, 192.
Priests, consecration by, 88.
their true office in the Christian Church, 189.
Primacy, alleged, of the Roman See, 109–113.
Primitive Church, agreement of Protestants with, 37, 149.
its satisfactions, what, 45.
Protestants, afflicted condition of, l.
persecution of, at Paris, lxxi.
and Roman Catholics, points in dispute between, 14.
agreement with the primitive Church, 37, 149.
not accountable for religious disturbances, 185.
not aliens from the true Church, 264.
probable treatment of, at a General Council, 280.
imaginary contrast between, 16, 17, 18.
imaginary judgment passed on, 18, 19.
Provincial Synods, how held, 225.
Psalms, Calvin's Commentary on Book of, lxxi.
Psychopannychia, Calvin's Treatise on, xxvi.
Punishment, why delayed, 246, 247.
Purgatory, dogma of, 47, 48, 99, 100.

Ratisbon, Dict of, xxxvi., xxxvii.

Digitized by Google

Reformation of the Church, 125, 200.
no ground for despair as to, 230, 231.
the paramount importance of, 230, 231.
the benefits conferred by, 147, 148, 201. See Calvin, Protestants, &c.
Reformers, their motives and conduct, 31, 32, 54, 55, 65, 66, 184, 233.
their mode of teaching, 41.
not accountable for religious disturbances, 185.
Relics, absurd importance attached to, 289, 290.
worship of, 131, 148, 150, 291, 292.
spurious, 150, 293, 294, 338, 341.
of the Apostles, alleged, 324–329. See Cross, &c.
Religion, Christian, principal points of, 126.
Religious service, absurdity of, in an unknown tongue, 158, 159, 190.
Repentance, its true nature, 78, 79.
Ridley, his martyrdom, xlix.
Rites, religious, traffic in, 140, 194, 195.
Romans, Calvin's Commentary on Epistle to, xxxv.
Rome, character of its Court, 28.
Romish Church, its claim to infallibility, 13.
not the true Church, 38.
bishops and prelates of, 50.
imaginary satisfactions of, 153.
seven alleged sacraments of, 165.
corruption of, 203, 258. See Idolatry, &c.
See, alleged primacy of, 217, 218, 219.
alleged reward of reverence for, 245, 246.
Roussel, Gerard, xxvi., xxxi.

Sacraments, profanation of, 38, 139, 168, 232.
Sacraments, how administered by Reformers, 39, 169.
their true nature, 83–86, 126, 127, 139, 165, 166.
their efficacy not dependant on the priest, 90. See Baptism, Supper.
Sacrifice, pretended, of the mass, 85, 138, 167, 196.
Sadolet, James, his character, xxxiv.
Calvin's reply to, xxxv.
his letter to the Genevese, xxxv.
his representation of the Reformers, 4, 5, 16, 17, 18.
his education, 28.
Safety of the Church, on what founded, 35, 38.
Saintonge, Calvin resides at, xxv.
Saints, intercession of, 47.
pretended miracles of, 92.
worship of, 93, 96, 155, 156, 188.
calendar of, 190, 191.
Salvation, how obtained, 9, 162.
different stages in the knowledge of, 133, 144.
Sanctification and justification, how connected, 43.
Satisfaction and atonement of Christ, 42.
and penances, no expiation by, 44.
what in primitive Church, 45.
dogma of, 78.
Satisfactions, imaginary, of Romish Church, 163.
Schism, its true nature, 49, 67, 211, 215, 216, 217.
Schoolmen, questions of, 146.
as to human nature, 234.
Scriptures, the study of, 39.
sufficiency of, 105.
Seats of Abbots at General Councils, 226; of Bishops, 226; of Cardinals, 226.
Sects, variety of, 19, 20.
Secundinianus, 225.
See, Romish, claims of, 239, 240.
Seed of the Church, 234.
Self-abasement, 127, 132.
Seneca de Clementia, Calvin writes a Commentary on, xxiv.

Digitized by Google

Sermons, character of, before Reformation, 40, 146.
Servetus, his heresies, lxi.
his works, lxi.
his condemnation and death, lxi.
his doctrine refuted by Calvin, lxv., lxvi.
Service. See Religious.
Sigismund, Emperor, 285.
Socinus, Lælius, Calvin's Letter to, lv.
Socrates, his Ecclesiastical History referred to, 303.
Somerset, Duke of, Calvin's Letter to, liii.
Sorbonne, Articles of Faith by, xliii.
Calvin's Antidote to, xliii.
persecution by, xxiv., xxv.
Theological Faculty of, 71.
Sorbonnists, their absurdities, 119.
Soul, immortality of, 15.
Sozomen referred to, 79, 180, 321.
Spires, Diet of, xlv., 328.
Spirit, Holy, inseparable from the Word, 36.
Stancarus, his heresy, lxxviii.
Stephen, alleged relics of, 331, 332.
Strasburg, Calvin studies theology at, xxxiv.
Succession, Apostolical, 101, 142, 170, 172, 173.
Supererogation, works of, 161, 163.
Superstition, prevalence of, 232.
Supper, Lord's, Calvin's Treatise on, xxxvi.
true nature of communion in, 45, 46, 137, 167, 169.
refusal of cup to the laity by Church of Rome, 49.
Last, alleged relics of, 299.
Supplementary merits of martyrs, 135.
Sylvester, Pope, 260.
Syndics, their office at Geneva, xxxiii.
Synods, provincial, how held, 225.

Temple, Jewish, Antiochus pollutes, 213.
Tertullian referred to, 87, 229.
Themistocles, his exclamation, 276.
Theodoret referred to, 73, 87, 277, 303.
Theodosius, Emperor, 245, 260 270.
alleged cause of his prosperity, 265.
Theology, state of, at time of Reformation, 40.
how improved by the Reformers, 40.
Traditions, human, 176.
Trajan, Emperor, legend as to the soul of, 85.
Transubstantiation, dogma of, 45, 46, 82, 83, 86, 87, 168, 196.
Trent, Council of, Calvin's Antidote to, lii.
Trust in God, 231.
Truth, description of, 6.
Turkish war, the fuel of, 233.
Types of Christ, 152.
Tyranny, ecclesiastical, 143, 144, 197.

Unction, extreme, a pretended sacrament, 91.
Unity of the Church, 20, 29, 211, 215, 217, 259, 266, 273.
Universal Head of the Church, Christ the, 110, 111.
Unknown tongue, absurdity of worshipping in an, 158, 159, 190.
Unleavened bread, dispute as to, xxxii.
Uzzah, his example, 242, 243, 266.
Uzziah, his example, 244.

Viret, his efforts to establish religion at Geneva, xxviii., 26.
his style of preaching, xxxix.
Virgil referred to, 85.
Virgin Mary, invocation of, 96, 119, 120.
epithets applied to, 190.
impious stanzas addressed to, 190.
alleged relics of, 316, 321.
Vows, how far obligatory, 116, 117, 118, 180.
against marriage unlawful, 117, 177, 178, 180, 181.

Waldenses, massacre of, xlvi.
Will, Calvin's, lxxxv.–lxxxix.

Digitized by Google

Wolman, Melchior, Calvin's friendship with, xxiii.
Word of God, its authority, 66, 73, 132, 133.
and Holy Spirit inseparably connected, 36.
Works, faith and, 9.
the obligation and recompence of, 160, 161.
their true place in the Christian system, 160, 161.
of supererogation, 163, 164.
no justification by, 42, 161, 164, 165, 193.
what deemed meritorious in the Romish Church, 193, 194.
Worship of God vitiated, great sinfulness and danger of, 12, 34, 35, 115.
of Images, 79, 131, 148, 188.
its pernicious effects, 98.
its true nature, 127.
pure and vitiated, distinction between, 128, 129, 132, 133, 151, 153, 189.
spiritual, man's natural aversion to, 153, 154.
of Relics, 131, 148, 150, 291, 292
of Saints, 93, 96, 155, 156, 188. See Idolatry, Images, Relics, Saints, &c.

THE END.

EDINBURGH PRINTING COMPANY, SOUTH ST DAVID STREET.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

JUL 17 1928

Digitized by Google